FBIS DAILY REPORT

CONTENTS

*Soviet Union*

Vol III No 032 18 February 1986

INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

ARMS CONTROL & DISARMAMENT

Editorial Article Contrasts Soviet, U.S. Attitudes [IZVESTIYA 18 Feb] AA 1
Grachev Interviewed on Disarmament, Austrian Role [Vienna VOLKSSTIMME 14 Feb] AA 3
Soviet 'Experts' Hold News Conference in Vienna AA 4
Press Conference Held on Gorbachev Proposals AA 5
U.S. Officials 'Camouflage' 'Obstructionist Stand' [Bogachev] AA 5
Bogachev Terms U.S. Position 'Irresponsible' AA 6
U.S. Response Will Show 'True Face' to World [Chernyshev] AA 7
U.S., Allies Take 'Cover Behind Wall of Silence' [Kudrin] AA 8
Arms Verification Seen as 'No Problem' for Accord [Kharkov] AA 9
East, West German Parties Hold Nuclear-Free Talks [Aksenov] AA 10
Commentary on Talks [Zholkver] AA 10
Weinberger Reaffirms Support for SDI Program AA 11
SDI Said Dangerous to World's Interests [Chernyshev] AA 11
SDI, Disarmament Proposal Aims Contrasted [Timofeyev in KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 14 Feb] AA 13
Possibility for Agreement Exists With Effort [Kobysh in LITERATURNAYA GAZETA 12 Feb] AA 14
U.S. Nuclear Tests Seen as 'Stumbling Block' [Beglov] AA 16

WORLD & REGIONAL ISSUES

Weekly 'International Observers Roundtable' [Bovin, Shishlin, Levin] CC 1
Melnikov Comments on UN Human Rights Meeting [PRAVDA 15 Feb] CC 8

UNITED STATES & CANADA

PRAVDA Examines Soviet-U.S. Trade Relations [Tolkunov, 15 Feb] A 1
Naval Exercises Confirm U.S. 'State Terrorism' [Gan in PRAVDA 14 Feb] A 3
Habib Visit May Exacerbate Philippine Situation [Kudrin] A 4
U.S. Plans in Haiti Based on Grenada Model [Zorin] A 4
Reagan's Visit to Grenada 'New Political Farce' A 5
U.S. Human Rights Report 'Garish Propaganda' [Orekhov] A 6
Republicans Waging Struggle for Reagan 'Heritage' [Zorin] A 6
Doubts Raised on Civilian Nature of New Aircraft [Kozakov] A 8
Trial Launch of U.S. Tomahawk Missile Noted A 9

CHINA

Arkhipov Reportedly To Visit PRC in March [AFP] B 1
Anniversary of Amity Treaty With PRC Noted [Ivanov] B 1
PRAVDA Cites Hanoi Paper's Criticism of PRC [16 Feb] B 2

NORTHEAST ASIA

Fishery Talks With Japan Suspended 15 February C 1
Defector Arrives in Japan, Seeks Asylum in U.S. [KYODO] C 1
Criticism of 'Team Spirit' Exercises Continues C 2
DPRK Meeting [PRAVDA 14 Feb] C 2
Korean Peace Threatened [Alekseyev] C 2
Linked With Plans for Japan [(Ruslanov)] C 3
DPRK Embassy Briefing C 4
Economic Cooperation With DPRK Examined [(Serinikov)] C 4
Rusakov Receives Mongolian Ambassador C 5

SOUTH ASIA

Zia Turns Facts 'Upside Down' in Remarks on DRA [Maksimov] D 1
Afghanistan Lodges UN Protest Against Pakistan D 1
Iran Warned Against Supporting Afghan Rebels [Sheftunov] D 2
DRA Peace Society Supports Soviet Arms Proposals D 3
Trade Agreement for 1986-1990 Signed With DRA [PRAVDA 14 Feb] D 4
Indian TV Cancels U.S. Film on Indira Gandhi D 4
Briefs: Literature Exchange With India; D 5
Peace Committee Delegation in Nepal

SOUTHEAST ASIA & PACIFIC

TASS Statement Rejects U.S. Actions in Pacific E 1
Philippine Assembly Declares Marcos Victor [PRAVDA 16 Feb] E 2
Cabinet Resigns E 3

EASTERN EUROPE

Husak, Zhivkov Praise Gorbachev Arms Proposals F 1
Husak Statement F 1
Zhivkov Statement F 1

WESTERN EUROPE

Unity of Portuguese Left Led to Election Victory [PRAVDA 18 Feb] G 1
Spain's Dilemma Over NATO Membership Viewed [Kudrin] G 1
Bonn Pressured To Accept New Chemical Weapons [Alekseyev, Glazunov] G 2
SPD, SED Discuss Nuclear Issues in Bonn G 4
Antonov Trial Ending; Western Backing Recalled [Rostov] G 4

MIDDLE EAST & NORTH AFRICA


Shevardnadze, Iraq's Tariq 'Aziz Discuss Gulf War H 1
Press Conference Addresses Mideast Issues H 1
PDRY Leader Denies Claims of Soviet Interference H 2


SUB-SAHARAN AFRICA


Reportage, Comment on Fighting in Chad J 1
French 'Military Interference' J 1
U.S. Preparing 'Armed Interference' J 1
[PRAVDA 16 Feb]
French 'Interventionist Corps' J 1
Dialogue Sought J 1
Events Described [PRAVDA 17 Feb] J 2
'Explosive Situation' Results J 3
Interference Benefits U.S. [Kulik] J 3
'Dual Objective' Pursued [Nikanorov in ISVESTIYA 18 Feb] J 4
SWAPO Leader Cited on Namibia Talks, Savimbi J 5

## EDITORIAL ARTICLE CONTRASTS SOVIET, U.S. ATTITUDES

PM171635 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 18 Feb 86 Morning Edition p 5

[Editorial article: "Action Must Be Taken!"]

[Text] Just a few days remain before the opening of the 27th CPSU Congress whose decisions will lay the foundations for a qualitatively new stage in the development of Soviet society and the further comprehensive activation of the USSR's peace-loving policy. By a UN decision 1986 has been declared International Peace Year and is designed to be a year of struggle for peace, a year of serious discussions on the nature of peace and measures for strengthening it. It was at the beginning of this year that, for the first time in the history of the nuclear age, the Soviet Union put forward a broad, specific program of innovatory spirit for totally liberating mankind from nuclear weapons by the start of the third millennium. The coincidence of such major events is symbolic in its way -- the struggle for the consolidation of peace and for radical headway in the laborious business of disarmament is today receiving unprecedented political impetus.

It is possible to ensure lasting peace and man's survival under present conditions only with the complete elimination of the gigantic nuclear arsenals. This idea is obvious. But something else should also become obvious to all: The elimination of nuclear weapons is inconceivable with the militarization of space. That is why, M.S. Gorbachev has said, "The prevention of the transfer of the arms race into space is regarded by the Soviet Union as a fundamental condition for preserving mankind."

It would be an oversimplification to believe that Washington is only thinking of how to press the nuclear buttons as quickly as possible. But it would be even more of an oversimplification to think that it is not preparing to do this given suitable conditions. It is preparing -- and strenuously. All they have to do is ensure their impunity, the Pentagon strategists and their high-ranking political patrons believe: to ensure it not only by lengthening the nuclear sword, but also by deploying an anti-missile shield over the United States. This must be done so that everything looks decorous: The United States is allegedly shifting to a strictly defensive strategy.

The Soviet Union rejects this dangerous concept for safeguarding security. It is the concept of an arms race, which has never yet ensured lasting peace. It is the concept of not only preserving, but also further rapidly building up high mountains of nuclear weapons and therefore, of intensifying the threat of nuclear annihilation.

The Soviet Union proceeds here from the premise that in the 21st century mankind must start off not from the "star wars" platform, but from the "star peace" platform combined with the complete absence of nuclear weapons on earth. Our country also proceeds from the premise that immediate and radical measures are essential and that a coordinated, comprehensive program aimed at eliminating forever, within an historically brief period, the threat of nuclear death looming over mankind is necessary to prevent a world nuclear-space catastrophe.

The Soviet Union has put forward such a program. As early as this year it would be possible to begin its implementation in order to free the peoples from the fear of a nuclear catastrophe. If, of course, there is a desire, above all on the part of the United States, to do so; desire of a principled order -- the readiness to coexist in a nuclear-free world, under a peaceful sky and space, to cooperate for the sake of progress on our planet, and to jointly ensure a reliable system of security for all.

The question of a military space is not a technical, but above all, a political question.

Some specialists across the ocean could spend a long time arguing about what percentage of the other side's warheads would penetrate the United States through the antimissile shield. But it is clear even now that, in any event, this "percentage" will be enough to destroy U.S. civilization. Others could discuss the function of this shield, attempting to ascertain how far it can be defensive. But it is clear even now that this shield, used in conjunction with the aggressor's sword and guided by his hand under the new conditions of the scientific-technical revolution, could be a weapon of unarming [obezoruzhivaniye]. Finally, one can argue about what degree of universal and national security there will be if the shield has two sides or, conversely, only one side and how effective a countermeasure will be to neutralize the space shield or how effective a counter-countermeasure will be. But there is scarcely any need for special proof that if the United States begins wide-scale ABM cover for its territory, the Soviet Union will take appropriate countermeasures. Something else is also clear: The strategic arms race will assume an unprecedented pace and dimension. Following the buildup of shields there will be a buildup of means to overcome them in order to retain the possibility of nuclear retribution; even if the U.S. side never has any need for this retribution, because war will never emanate from the Soviet Union.

The disputes will continue even further. But you should not believe that the truth will be revealed by the scientific research work being done in the United States in the field of space ABM defense. To expect such a "truth" means coming to terms in advance with the fact that the United States will start to deploy space strike armaments. That means acknowledging that the USSR's call for new military-political thinking cannot be supported because the avalanche-like process of military rivalry is allegedly insurmountable. No, our country opposes this assessment of the situation and resolutely advocates breaking down the "logic" of the arms race.

The Soviet Union believes that it is truly criminal to waste time under conditions when the pace of the arms race is outstripping that of talks. Time is now too precious and for that reason, the most favorable atmosphere possible must be created at disarmament talks. The adoption of the nuclear disarmament program proposed by the Soviet Union with its nuclear, and other aspects would make it possible to add to mankind's account the undoubted bonuses of the Soviet proposals: the establishment of clearly defined routes and guidelines, the fixing of concrete deadlines for reaching and implementing accords, and the attribution of direction and purposefulness to the talks. The adoption of this program would make the U.S. Administration's statements on its commitment to the goal of eliminating nuclear weapons definitely sincere, instead of merely ostentatious.

The alternative to this rational approach is extraordinarily dangerous and there must be a special realization of this now that the world is on a dangerous nuclear and space brink. If the improvement and buildup of nuclear armaments alone in the seventies began threatening particularly forcefully to destabilize the strategic situation, the combination of those actions with the additional space element in the eighties will increase the danger of destabilization many times over. With the further development of that combination -- and that would be inevitable since the arms race process would become irreversible -- mankind would lose control of the solution to the problem of "to be or not to be." The U.S. desire for military superiority, which is a constant factor, could then be implemented more quickly and limitlessly. And that threatens catastrophe. The Soviet Union urges the renunciation of thinking in terms of military strength, which leads to catastrophe. Observable restraint in the military sphere is the best proof of the USSR's readiness to work toward nullifying all armaments.

When calling for radical disarmament, primarily nuclear disarmament, the Soviet Union does not believe for a moment that U.S. agreement with the historic Soviet initatives would cause the differences between our countries to disappear.

No, we are realists. The rivalry will remain in different spheres because the two sides belong to opposite sociopolitical systems. But this rivalry must not be permitted to develop into military confrontation at any stage. The systems' advantages must be demonstrated in peaceful spheres and only in peaceful spheres.

By all accounts such an approach has still not prevailed in Washington. The U.S. Administration's attitude to the new Soviet proposals is still not uniformly positive. There has still been no official response to these proposals. It is hard to say how thoroughly and from what viewpoint the Soviet initiatives are being studied across the ocean, but the process of this "study" has already gone on for an unseemly length of time. The world does not need subterfuges, pretexts, or propaganda statements on questions of peace and disarmament, it needs practical deeds. To achieve that, the leadership of all countries must rise above national egotism, tactical strife, and disputes and break with traditional ideas about the unshakable priority of building up military strength. In our age these ideas are tantamount to agreeing to national suicide. Peace and international and national security can only be ensured on the basis of political measures and by consistent and large-scale disarmament. Everyone must recognize that this is the axiom of the nuclear and space age. But even that is no longer enough. It is necessary to act energetically and purposefully so that survival prevails forever over the threat of annihilation.

## GRACHEV INTERVIEWED ON DISARMAMENT, AUSTRIAN ROLE

AU141146 Vienna VOLKSSTIMME in German 14 Feb 86 p 3

["Exclusive Interview" given by Andrey Grachev, "department head in the CPSU Central Committee and head of a delegation of experts and military personnel that visited Austria during the past few days" to VOLKSSTIMME reporter Otto Janecek in Vienna]

[Text] Question: Do you think that the SDI program can be stopped in the United States at all? Quite a lot of business interests are involved. The military-industrial group hopes to rake in billions of dollars. There are large lobbies for SDI in the U.S. Congress.

Answer: You are right, there are many people in the United States who are interested in the SDI project. But these groups are very different. Let us take, for instance, Reagan himself. He considers himself the savior of the world or at least the savior of the United States. But I have got the impression that since the Geneva summit Reagan's conviction in this respect has been shaken a bit.

I believe the power of [illegible] arguments which were put forth by our General Secretary Gorbachev have also had an influence on Reagan. The arguments concerning armament in space, which are stated by our leadership, are very simple, but they are also very convincing. First of all, SDI will never be 100-percent impenetrable. And if only a hole of 10 percent for incoming missiles existed, this would be enough to destroy the United States. Even only 1 percent of the strategic missiles correspond to about 5,000 Hiroshima bombs. No country is able to survive anything like that, least of all the United States. Thus, this is a point of view with which one can influence the decisions in the United States -- and we are working in this direction.

Of course, the military-industrial group in the United States wants to make a profit, even at the cost of reducing their own security, because a destabilization of the strategic situation will also lead to a decrease in security for the United States. But we have already seen several times in the past that projects, even U.S. projects, have been stopped when they became obviously absurd. In this connection much depends on public opinion -- in the United States and abroad.

We also believe, that one day even the strategic thinkers in the United States will find out that they are working for a pure nonsense, for a nonsense that is contrary to their own interests and their own security. Our conclusion is: Nothing is irreversible. In order to prevent the world from sliding into an even more dangerous situation, it is, however, necessary to explain the absurdity of the SDI concept. For this purpose everything has to be used, including public opinion in the European countries.

Question: Do you think that the Challenger disaster could also influence public opinion in the United States?

Answer: Certainly. Because the Challenger disaster has made the problems in connection with SDI obvious. In a paradoxical way the Challenger disaster confirmed the argument that Gorbachev used in his discussion with Reagan in Geneva. Gorbachev said: Look, Mr President, just imagine a situation in which your SDI has already been deployed. It might happen that an asteriod crashes into one of your platforms, then the computers will react in the same way as if an attack had taken place. The computers will give the order to launch the missiles. And men would die because the computers decided in such a way.

Question: Austria is a neutral country. What can small, neutral countries contribute to the issue of disarmament?

Answer: I would say that in this time of enormous military potentials the role of the small countries and the neutral countries is paradoxically increasing. The increase of military potentials in fact reduces the security of the large countries. They are not faced with the problem of using their weapons, but with the problem of not having to use them. That means that more and more political power is transferred to the place where political initiatives are introduced, where there are political proposals, where a voice is raised. And I think that the political attitude of such countries as Austria is an important part of public opinion -- all over the world.

You get a confirmation of this in the attitude of the small countries at the various international conferences, such as in Vienna or Stockholm or Geneva. Every time it is necessary to find a compromise between the opposing positions of East and West, the most important role is played by the small, neutral countries. And Austria, too, belongs to these countries.

I would put it this way: Although such counties as Austria are not nuclear powers themselves, they have another potential, a political one. They have many ways of influencing the situation in Europe and in the world. And they should use this potential to the utmost.

SOVIET 'EXPERTS' HOLD NEWS CONFERENCE IN VIENNA

LD171850 Moscow TASS in English 1546 GMT 17 Feb 86

[Text] Vienna, February 17 TASS -- Taking into account the keen interest shown all over the world in the statement on disarmament issued by Mikhail Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, and numerous requests by members of the press for explanations and comments on its individual provisions, a group of Soviet foreign-policy experts have arrived in Vienna under arrangements with the Soviet Embassy in Austria.

They held a news conference in the press club of the Austrian capital, which dealt with the latest Soviet disarmament initiatives and was attended by numerous journalists representing the Austrian and foreign press, including leading Vienna papers, and the news agencies of a number of countries.

It was pointed out at the news conference that Mikhail Gorbachev's statement sets forth a concrete and detailed plan for action to remove the most formidable threat facing mankind today, that of a nuclear war.

The Soviet experts also called attention to the extension by the USSR, as a gesture of good will, of its unilateral moratorium on all nuclear explosions till March 31 and to its repeated call on the United States to join the constructive step.

The Soviet experts also answered questions from attending newsmen.

PRESS CONFERENCE HELD ON GORBACHEV PROPOSALS

LD171222 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1203 GMT 17 Feb 86

[Text] Stockholm 17 Feb (TASS) -- A press conference took place at the Soviet Embassy here attended by representatives of the Swedish mass information media, political parties, trade unions, scientific circles, and peace movements supporters.

The Soviet representatives answered many questions on the main parts of the 15 January statement by CPSU Central Committee General Secretary M.S. Gorbachev. Particular attention was devoted to the European aspect of the Soviet disarmament program, as well as to questions on ending all nuclear tests and the role of Sweden in the work of the Delhi "Six".

Taking part in the press conference was a group of Soviet experts and the Soviet Ambassador to Sweden Boris Pankin.

U.S. OFFICIALS 'CAMOUFLAGE' 'OBSTRUCTIONIST STAND'

LD151816 Moscow TASS in English 1752 GMT 15 Feb 86

[Text] Moscow, February 15 TASS -- Vladimir Bogachev, TASS military news analyst, writes:

In their public statements, high-ranking representatives of the U.S. Administration "welcome" the new proposals on nuclear disarmament put forward by the Soviet Union, including also on medium-range missiles. Even American general Bernard Rogers, the NATO allied commander in Europe, described them as a "positive fact" in his interview with the newspaper NEUE OSNABRUECKER ZEITUNG. As the Belgian news agency said, Paul Nitze, U.S. presidential consultant, stressed during his meetings in Brussels, that there now exists a possibility to reach a Soviet-American agreement on medium-range missiles in Europe.

As is known, the Soviet Union proposed as the first step on the way of ridding the European Continent of nuclear weapons that Soviet and American medium-range missiles in the European zone be completely eliminated. In so doing the USA should commit itself not to supply its strategic and medium-range missiles to other countries, while Britain and France -- should not build up their respective weapons.

The newspaper WASHINGTON POST said that at a meeting at the U.S. State Department, presidential advisors proposed that instead of complete elimination of Soviet and American medium-range missiles in the European zone, as is proposed by the Soviet Union, a part of such missiles be preserved in Europe, while unilateral reductions of Soviet SS-20 be carried out in Asia. They claim that Washington will not accept the Soviet terms for a freeze on the British and French nuclear forces and will insist on the right of the USA to turn over American sea-based Trident-2 missiles to London.

One cannot help asking the question what the presidential advisors propose to leave of the Soviet proposal on the medium-range missiles in the European zone, which they "welcome" by word of mouth? Practically nothing.

There is an impression, that some U.S. Administration officials, who do not dare to reject openly the Soviet initiatives, which have ardent support of the world public, are forced to maneuver, to camouflage their obstructionist stand on the disarmament problems. "Disarmament proposals have been recently coming from Moscow, which cause fear even in U.S. Secretary of Defence Caspar Weinberger," says the West German newspaper FRANKFURTER RUNDSCHAU. It looks like they arouse fear not only in Weinberger.

In order to reject in a highly diplomatic manner a positive proposal of the other side, it is necessary to agree with it in principle, but reject in essence, the architects of the English school of diplomacy of the 19th century lectured. Some Washington officials have, apparently, decided to follow this obsolete rule.

The European aspect of the nuclear problem has been a subject of discussion for many years now, while the security conditions in Europe continue deteriorating. The Soviet Union proposes to put an end to such developments, to cut this Gordian knot and rid Europe both of the medium-range nuclear weapons and tactical ones. It is absolutely obvious that the implementation of the Soviet initiatives cannot be detrimental to any country either in Europe, or, the more so, in America.

The world public has the right to expect that common sense will prevail in Washington, that the U.S. reply to the Soviet initiatives, including on medium-range missiles, will be based on the true interests of strengthening security in all countries without exception.

BOGACHEV TERMS U.S. POSITION 'IRRESPONSIBLE'

LD141546 Moscow TASS in English 1525 GMT 14 Feb 86

[Text] Moscow, February 14 TASS -- By TASS military writer Vladimir Bogachev.

Experts are unanimous that, within the broad range of possible practical actions on curbing the arms race, ending nuclear explosions would be the simplest and at the same time exclusively effective measure that would put an end to the process of developing new and perfecting the existing types of nuclear weapons.

To end the tests, it is necessary that each nuclear state issue as a first step a corresponding order to its military and scientific communities. Simultaneously, it will be possible to agree on concrete measures for checking compliance with the moratorium. Both the USSR and the United States possess technical means that make it possible to accurately determine the location and yield of any nuclear blasts, and to clearly distinguish them from earthquakes. In addition to the existing national means of verification, the Soviet Union offers the use of other, fundamentally new means. The USSR backed the proposal by several states to set up on their territories special stations to monitor compliance with the agreement banning the tests.

The Soviet side expressed its readiness to agree with the United States, after imposing a reciprocal moratorium on nuclear blasts, on some measures of on-site verification to lift doubts as to observance of the moratorium. The verification problem would thus be practically resolved. Using the strictest criteria, it can no longer be regarded as an obstacle in the way of an agreement on terminating nuclear explosions. The road would be ultimately paved for reaching an accord on a total prohibition of nuclear testing between the USSR, the United States and Britain to which other countries could join.

It is important to stress that, simple and reliable as the measures to end nuclear testing are, they can only be implemented given the readiness of at least two great powers -- the USSR and the United States -- to put roadblocks in the way of the nuclear arms race. The Soviet Union has already made the first step towards banning nuclear explosions. In a bid to set into motion the solution of the problem, the USSR unilaterally suspended all nuclear explosions from August 6 last year, and urged the United States to follow the good example. In January 1986, the Soviet Union extended the moratorium till March 31, and stated that it would remain in effect beyond that should the United States halt its own nuclear test programme.

Defying public protests, the United States responded to the Soviet Union's major goodwill gesture with nuclear explosions at the Nevada test site. Washington's actions show that the United States remains committed to the illusory and peace-endangering goal of achieving military superiority.

The Soviet Union welcomes any practical steps that help reduce the level of military confrontation. In face of intensive military preparations of the United States, however, the USSR cannot display indefinitely its unilateral restraint, including in the sphere of nuclear testing.

The U.S. Administration, which constantly expresses its readiness "to go its mile towards disarmament", ought to corroborate its verbal declarations by practical deeds. Joining the Soviet moratorium on nuclear blasts could become the first positive step by the United States over the past five years in that direction.

The stakes are too high. The real chances of improving the overall climate of the international situation cannot be missed due to the shortsighted and irresponsible position of the United States towards a comprehensive ban on nuclear testing.

U.S. RESPONSE WILL SHOW 'TRUE FACE' TO WORLD

LD171835 Moscow TASS in English 1827 GMT 17 Feb 86

[Text] Moscow, February 17 TASS -- TASS military news analyst Vladimir Chernyshev writes:

The package of far-reaching Soviet peace initiatives set forth in a statement by Mikhail Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, has been summed up in the world as "a comprehensive blueprint for peace," "a prescription for survival" and "the sole cure for the nuclear disease." It offers a realistic prospect for delivering the planet from nuclear weapons by the year 2000.

The complete elimination of Soviet and U.S. medium-range missiles in the European zone can mark a first step on this noble path, a first "course of treatment for the nuclear disease."

The Soviet leadership has explained that its proposal on this issue is not accompanied by any conditions, except a renunciation by Britain and France of their buildup of corresponding nuclear weapons and a commitment by the United States not to transfer its missiles, either strategic or medium-range, to other countries.

Everything seems to be clear and definite in this proposal. It takes into account the interests of all those who are interested in fact rather than in words in real progress towards ridding the European continent of nuclear arms.

Such proposals, U.S. Congressman Gerry Studds remarked bluntly, could not be easily turned down by the United States. This is because of the fact that if Washington keeps rejecting all Soviet attempts to bring about detente, this will give the rest of the world every reason to believe that the nuclear buildup is the only language understood by the United States. The fact apparently has been realized in Washington, which perhaps explains why U.S. Administration officials have of late been saying again and again that Washington is drafting a "response" to the Soviet proposal on medium-range missiles.

But the substance of the response, judging by American press reports, clearly fails to show a desire really to advance along the road of eradicating the "nuclear disease".

The West German newspaper FRANKFURTER ALLGEMEINE described the draft American response as a "revival " of the old "zero option". It said it will hardly suit the Soviet Union since the U.S. Administration will refuse to undertake not to hand over its missiles to other countries (and so will retain the possibility to supply Trident-2 missiles to Britain). The impression also is that Washington has already "persistently advised" Britain and France not to take any part even in the very first course of treatment for the "nuclear disease", that is not to agree to renounce the buildup of their respective nuclear weapons.

Moreover, according to THE BOSTON GLOBE, the U.S. Administration's aim is to demand still greater cuts in Soviet medium-range missiles, while offering nothing in return. Specifically, Washington intends to demand an additional reduction of 50 percent of the Soviet SS-20 missiles in Asia without any accompanying cuts in the American nuclear weapons in the region. The attempt to revive the "zero option", and a "zero option" at that with changes for the worse, dooms the resolution of the medium-range missile issue to failure in advance.

Some of the U.S. spokesmen are openly declaring unwillingness to reduce the American medium-range missiles in the European zone in any case. U.S. General Bernard Rogers, supreme allied commander in Europe, for one, openly voiced the apprehensions of the "hawks" when he contended that destroying medium-range weapons would mean that the Pershing-2 and cruise missiles, that is the weapons which, he said, were the binding link between European and American security, would disappear from Europe.

His claim made it appear as if there were no "linkage" between European and American security before the deployment of U.S. medium-range missiles in Western Europe and the "linkage" will be no longer be there with the complete elimination of nuclear weapons. But in fact the general and other "hawks" are concerned about something else. U.S. medium-range missiles are first-strike weapons and are among the basic elements of the U.S.-propelled arms race, a "binding link" of this race. This is why some people in Washington are reluctant to see this link disappear because then the entire chain can come apart. But they forget in the process that their response to the Soviet proposals will show the entire world the true face, the true intentions of Washington.

U.S. ALLIES TAKE 'COVER BEHIND WALL OF SILENCE'

LD171853 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1548 GMT 17 Feb 86

[From "The World Today" program presented by Igor Kudrin]

[Text] The United States and the North Atlantic bloc, after high-level consultations on the latest Soviet proposals, have taken cover behind a wall of silence.

This is a quotation from the British newspaper THE GUARDIAN. I have not selected it accidentally; in my view the paper's Brussels correspondent has found a very accurate definition of the West's position -- a wall of silence. Indeed, 15 February was exactly 1 month since the publication of Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev's statement.

The days go by, but there is no response from across the ocean, although headlines of the type "The United States Plans a Positive Response to the Soviet Proposals" are not fading from U.S. newspapers. As yet, they are only planning. Of course, the package of major initiatives from the Soviet Union require serious and deep analysis and study. In addition, Washington needed to consult with Bonn and Paris, London and Brussels, Tokyo and Beijing. All of this is understandable, but the days inexorably go by.

At the end of January, THE WASHINGTON POST wrote that the Soviet arms control proposal, which was both thorough and sharp, forced the White House to move onto the defensive. The (?reactionaries') camp has also gone to ground for a bit: The Soviet Union's proposal to enter the 21st century without nuclear and chemical weapons has had too impressive an effect on millions of people. But while Washington delays its response, the right-wing politicians and the press are continually moving to the attack. Fantasies have again come into circulation. Pentagon chief Weinberger said: The Soviet proposal is basically a propagandistic gesture and there is no need to change anything in U.S. policy. They try to hush up, or at times distort, the essence of certain important clauses in the statement. They even go as far as forgery and deception: Supposedly, the Soviet Union is prepred to sign a perfectly insignificant agreement, while President Reagan does not have to renounce his Strategic Defense Initiative.

We knew in advance that our proposals would not be to the liking of some in the West. Detente still has many enemies. However, they are increasingly in the minority. A recent U.S. public opinion poll demonstrated that 74 percent of Americans support the USSR's proposal for the liquidation of nuclear weapons by 2000. Indeed, the West has to give a response before its own peoples. I would like to be an optimist and believe that the U.S. side will yet give a positive response. Herbert Wells wisely noted: If we do not put an end to war, war will put an end to us.

ARMS VERIFICATION SEEN AS 'NO PROBLEM' FOR ACCORD

LD171631 Moscow TASS in English 1543 GMT 17 Feb 86

[Text] Moscow, February 17 TASS -- TASS news analyst Vasiliy Kharkov writes:

The British newspaper FINANCIAL TIMES writes today that with modern technical means, arms control agreements can be verified with a high degree of confidence. The paper denounces those "hawks" in the Reagan administration that seek to make "effective verification" the keystone of their negative position towards the Soviet disarmament programme. "The real problem with verification, however, is not so much technical as political", the FINANCIAL TIMES underlines.

One cannot fail to agree with this view. And indeed, the question of verification lies in the political and good will which Washington should display. As far as the Soviet Union is concerned verification is no problem. The Soviet stand with regard to armaments under destruction and limitation, which was formulated in the January 15 statement by the General Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee Mikhail Gorbachev, is crystal clear and rules out any false speculation. The Soviet Union is prepared to effect in practice any measures of the most rigid control whether it is related to refusal to conduct any nuclear explosions, a ban on the development of space strike arms (to the point of inspection of relevant laboratories), the elimination of chemical weapons or reduction in conventional arms, etc.

No one can object to the fact that the issue of effective verification is highly important in the cause of nuclear disarmament. Opponents of disarmament have been clinging to this problem to this day in a bid to prevent progress in accomplishing this task of vital importance in our day and age. The Soviet Union has a no less stake in verification than any other side. It fosters this strong interest of itself with drafting large-scale measures to verify limitation, reduction, and liquidation of armaments. The U.S.S.R. holds that concrete agreements on disarmament should be verified both by national technical means and on-site inspection through international procedures. The U.S.S.R. suggested the United States coming to terms on this.

But the Soviet Union underscores that the point at issue should be control over disarmament and not armament, for which "hawks" in the United States and NATO are actually after.

The appeal by the Soviet Union, addressed to the entire mankind, to enter the 21st century without nuclear weapons, to harness the energy of the atom to the service of peace, meets the aspirations of all peoples. This appeal is ardently supported by hundreds of millions of people on all continents, who expect from Washington a constructive and businesslike approach to it.

EAST, WEST GERMAN PARTIES HOLD NUCLEAR-FREE TALKS

LD142022 Moscow TASS in English 1941 GMT 14 Feb 86

[Text] Moscow, February 14 TASS -- TASS commentator Lev Aksenov writes:

The delegations of the Social Democratic Party of Germany [SPD] and the Socialist Unity Party of Germany [SED] had a meeting in Bonn today to discuss formation of a nuclear-free zone in central Europe. The significance of the meeting exceeds by far the limits of inter-party relations between the Social Democratic Party of Germany and the Socialist Unity Party of Germany. Considering the topicality of the problem, the solution of which is, in the final account, crucial to preservation of peace globally.

Socialist states, other countries put forward a number of proposals to deliver various regions from the most terrible weapons of mass destruction, created by man. Mention should be made here of the proposal of the GDR and Czechoslovakia to the FRG Government that a zone free from chemical weapons be formed in central Europe, the initiatives to make the Balkan peninsula and the north of Europe nuclear-free zones.

All these peace proposals go along with the comprehensive program of delivering the world from weapons of mass destruction, which was formulated in the January 15 statement by General Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee Mikhail Gorbachev. The measures being discussed now on the banks of the Rhine River by representatives of political parties of both German states, will help mankind approach the third millennium in conditions of peace, security and confidence. The business-like discussion of one of the most important problems of European security, but not heightening of tension in one of the most "sensitive" parts of the planet -- this is the cardinal way to a world without weapons, a world without wars.

Commentary on Talks

LD152003 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1600 GMT 15 Feb 86

[Excerpts] In Bonn talks have taken place between delegates of the SPD and the SED on the question of creating a nuclear-free zone in central Europe. A commentary on the latest news; at the microphone is our political observer, Aleksandr Zholkver:

The meeting in Bonn in my opinion is noteworthy in many respects. First of all, it bears witness to the popularity of the idea of zones free from nuclear weapons. But you see, this idea is repeatedly anathematized by the NATO leadership which is certainly busy not limiting nuclear arms, but accumulating them. And now, despite the concentrated Atlantic propaganda about the blessing of U.S. nuclear missles which are being sited in West Germany itself, one of the leading political parties of the country, the SPD, is unambiguously speaking out against the transatlantic nuclear gifts and in favor of declaring the FRG a nuclear-free zone. As far as the SED is concerned, it is, as is known, the ruling party in the GDR and has repeatedly supported at governmental level the creation of a zone free of nuclear weapons in central Europe.

I point out in this connection that the idea of nuclear-free zones is spreading more and more not only in central Europe. I remind you that our country actively supports the idea of the creation of non-nuclear zones as one of the measures to limit nuclear arms and avert their gradual spread over the planet. The Soviet Union is ready to give effective guarantees to any country that refuses to site nuclear weapons on its territory.

Quite another stance is taken by the United States. Suffice it to remember how Washington was up in arms against New Zealand when its government refused to allow U.S. ships carrying nuclear arms into its ports. Nonetheless, the present discussions by the SPD and SED delegations on the question of creating nuclear-free zones clearly confirms that public opinion supports this idea as a considerable contribution to the strengthening of the cause for peace.

WEINBERGER REAFFIRMS SUPPORT FOR SDI PROGRAM

LD141734 Moscow TASS in English 1639 GMT 14 Feb 86

[Text] New York, February 14 TASS -- The loss of the space shuttle Challenger will not block U.S. pursuit of the Strategic Defence Initiative (SDI) programme, U.S. Defence Secretary Caspar Weinberger stressed Thursday in an interview with ASSOCIATED PRESS editors. He made it clear that if flights under the space shuttle programme are not resumed within the next six months, the Pentagon might have to turn to alternatives for launching military objects and spy satellites. Acknowledging that the disaster could have an impact on several SDI projects, he stressed that the work on devising a partically space-based anti-missile defence has not been suspended, but is following the early schedule.

The defence secretary's obsession with the idea of space militarization, despite human casualties, have caused bewilderment among the journalists. They made an attempt to find out whether the United States could accept an intricate space defence system like "star wars" in view of the accident that destroyed the shuttle. To this, Weinberger cynically replied, "I certainly don't think we should stop working on it because we had a terrible tragedy on the shuttle."

SDI SAID DANGEROUS TO WORLD'S INTERESTS

LD30012 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1822 GMT 12 Feb 86

["The Question of the Militarization of Space; The 'Starry' Road to Strategic Chaos" -- TASS headline]

[Text] Moscow, 12 Feb (TASS) -- Vladimir Chernyshev, TASS military observer writes:

The U.S. creators of "star wars" are trying to present the SDI program as almost being a means of "reinforcing" strategic stability and as an opportunity to move, with the help of an extensive antimissile defense system involving space-based elements, "from a strategy founded on the threat of offensive power to a strategy that threatens no one." There is nothing further from the truth than assertions of this kind.

In actual fact, the militarization of space will inevitably lead to the disappearance of the very concept of strategic stability and will turn the present strategic balance into strategic chaos. Distrust among countries will rise, while the security of all countries will be significantly lowered. This is the way that the Soviet Union assesses the dangers that "star wars" constitute for mankind. And this opinion, this assessment is shared throughout the world, including the United States, by prominent politicians, military experts, and scientists, SDI, they declare, is an intrusion of fantasy into politics, a mixture of unrealizable dream and confused strategy. Implementation of the "star wars" program will dangerously destabilize the situation, will make it even more explosive, and, one fine day, will strike back like a boomerang at the United States itself.

What, then, is the point? What are the circumstances producing this "starry" road to strategic chaos? First, there is a close interconnection between strategic offensive and defensive weapons; effective measures to limit antimissile defensive systems constitute a substantial factor in restraining the arms race in strategic offensive weapons. But the disturbing or ignoring this interconnection inevitably leads to an increase in their numbers. The higher the piles of weapons, the less stable is the situation. The interdependence of offensive and defensive weapons is nontransitory and universal in nature: It is not "eroded" and does not vanish with the appearance of the possibility of creating technically more sophisticated and effective antimissile defense systems.

Official Washington consciously "overlooks" the fact that strike weapons as well as defensive weapons have, over the last 10-15 years, undergone considerable technical development, the initiator of which has been the United States in every specific case. What is more, nothing is being said there either about the important point that, with the "brilliant promise" of the development of technology suitable for SDI, offensive weapons can, undoubtedly, within the same time frame, also make significant strides in their development. So that if one compares the development of technology suitable for "defensive" missions and the development of technology that may considerably boost the possibilities of offensive potential, the advantages of the "defensive" systems proclaimed by "star wars" supporters do not look at all convincing.

Second, the introduction into the strategic equation of a qualitatively new component, which is what the ABM systems with space-based elements would be, creates an additional element of uncertainty in the strategic balance, which is a natural consequence of the differences in the systems that the two sides will have, even if these differences are inconsiderable. As has already occurred with strategic offensive weapons, the development in the new sphere would proceed along different paths for the two leading nuclear powers. Such a circumstance would increase the concern of each of them about the possibility of asymmetry arising in strategic potentials.

Third, the development [razrabotka] and deployment of an antimissile defense will lead to an accelerated creation [sozdaniye] and improvement of means of counteracting this defense, means of penetrating it with strategic offensive weapons, that is, adding yet another fundamentally new element to the strategic equation and consequently, even greater uncertainty. In response to the development of means of countering the ABM system and penetrating it, the sides would acquire weapons to oppose them -- counter-response weapons, counter-counter measures -- which would serve to further increase uncertainty in the strategic balance.

Competition between offence and defense will become a sort of "racing round in circles;" weapons, counter-weapons, counter-counter weapons, and so on ad infinitum.

This "racing round in circles," this endless stepping up of ever more and more turns of the arms race spiral will be accompanied by a sharp worsening of strategic stability and a movement towards general uncertainty and fear linked with this whole increase in the risk of catastrophe. SDI will not create any sort of "perfect world of defense," but will destroy the idea of mutual deterrence.

The U.S. concept is aimed at achieving absolute security for itself and at placing everyone else in a position of "absolute danger." This is a concept which is vicious and dangerous for the world. That is why the USSR is consistently and stubbornly opposed to the "star wars" program and is struggling for the introduction into life of the concept of equal security, the strengthening of which could be implemented by way of reducing armaments and by disarming, going as far as the total elimination of nuclear weapons.

SDI, DISARMAMENT PROPOSAL AIMS CONTRASTED

PM141624 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 14 Feb 86 First Edition p 3

[Colonel A. Timofeyev article: "Ruinous Venture; the United States Continues a Policy Aimed at the Militarization of Space"]

[Excerpt] Defenders of SDI frequently claim, demagogically, that peace and stability would be strengthened if the Soviet Union and the United States were simultaneously to deploy large-scale ABM systems. But this is an unsound argument. In order to be convinced of this, you have only to take a sober look, for example, at individual aspects of such a hypothetical situation. Since it is impossible in practice to properly evaluate and compare the effectiveness of such systems with the inevitable differences between them, it is natural that, afraid of ending up worse off, each side would seek to strengthen its own strategic potential in the spheres of both defensive and offensive means. That is, the stockpiling of weapons would continue and stability would be undermined.

Another fact is no less obvious. Given parallel possession of large-scale ABM systems, a "first strike" strategy would prove preferable, since such a strike inflicted simultaneously -- both at the enemy's ABM system (particularly its most vulnerable space element) and at his territory -- would clearly benefit the attacking side. The aggressor would deprive the enemy of a proper opportunity to withstand the attack and, at the same time, would retain the ability to parry a counterstrike. As a result, the development of events in the world would be totally unpredictable.

However, talk of parallel possession belongs to the realm of theoretical argument. As the facts attest, the U.S. architects of "star wars" do not, in fact, conceive of any such thing. On the contrary, by means of a breakthrough in the technological sphere they hope to achieve a military advantage in space and, at the same time, supremacy on earth. Everything attests to the fact that Washington has again decided to outwit reality. And the reality is that each new U.S. threat to the Soviet Union has invariably entailed a corresponding decrease in the latter's own security. "...If we speak of this so-called technological superiority, which it is proposed to realize within SDI and thereby, place the Soviet Union in a difficult position," M.S. Gorbachev pointed out, "then...this is another delusion. An answer will be found."

The Soviet Union cannot allow the United States to upset the military equilibrium in its favor. The disruption of military-strategic parity is particularly dangerous now that the arsenals are overfull of nuclear weapons.

In the past the Soviet Union has repeatedly caught up with the United States in whatever types of strategic arms it has forged ahead with and, if SDI is not given the red light, the Soviet Union will take the necessary measures this time also. However, the piling up of new pyramids of weapons is not our choice.

The path which the Soviet Union urges people to follow is the path toward the total elimination of nuclear weapons throughout the world. A specific program for the elimination of nuclear weapons, calculated for a precisely defined period of time, is set forth in the statement by M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee. At the very first stage of its implementation it is planned that over the course of 5-8 years the Soviet Union and the United States will halve the nuclear arms capable of reaching each other's territory.

It goes without saying that such a reduction is possible only if the Soviet Union and the United States mutually renounce the creation [sozdaniye], testing, and deployment of space strike arms. Space must be kept peaceful and such arms must not be deployed there. They must not even be created [sozdavat]. Fixing a padlock to the resolution of this problem means not wanting to end the arms race on earth.

Unfortunately, the United States is continuing to step up its efforts to realize the misanthropic "star wars" plans. Washington politicians, who now talk so much about clear skies for mankind, are in reality working to literally cram the sky above our earth with strike weapons of unprecedented power. All this leads to an increased threat of war and, at a certain stage, could make it probable.

Although it is planned to finish implementing the whole "star wars" venture only after decades have elapsed, it will bring very serious consequences in the very near future. For, by implementing the "star wars" program, Washington is, in point of fact, deliberately working to wreck the present talks and to nullify all existing arms limitation agreements. In that case the whole world would find itself in a situation of an uncontrolled arms race, strategic chaos, most dangerous undermining of stability, universal uncertainty and fear, and an increased risk of nuclear catastrophe associated with all this.

The authors of the U.S. "star wars" program assign the 15 years remaining until the end of the 20th century to "deliverance from nuclear arms" with the help of the creation [sozdaniye] and deployment of the notorious space "shield." The Soviet Union proposes totally curing the earth of its nuclear ailment. Of course, the implementation of the Soviet program for ensuring equal security for all on the path of arms reduction and disarmament, right down to the total elimination of all types of weapons of mass destruction, demands tremendous effort, labor, persistent struggle, and the breaking of thousand-year-old traditions. But, as M.S. Gorbachev pointed out in his replies to L'HUMANITE's questions, "The world simply cannot continue to live and act in the old way when there is a real threat of nuclear war."

## POSSIBILITY FOR AGGREEMENT EXISTS WITH EFFORT

PM111555 Moscow LITERATURNAYA GAZETA in Russian 12 Feb 86 p 9

[Vitaliy Kobysh "Observer's Opinion": "The Challenge of the Era"]

[Text] M.S. Gorbachev's answers to questions from L'HUMANITE constitute another in the whole series of documents of great political importance put forward by the Soviet leadership in this particular period in the life of mankind.

The answers touch on a wide range of problems in both our domestic life and in international life. Profound and, at the same time, sharp and extremely frank judgments were given on each of them. Everyone of the problems thus illuminated merits close attention and detailed discussion. We are taking just one of them as the subject of this column.

In his answers to L'HUMANITE's questions M.S. Gorbachev dwelt on the challenge thrown down by the age and the need to answer it in a worthy fashion. That challenge, as the CPSU Central Committee general secretary observed, is a dual one. On the one hand, it is linked to the fact that Soviet society has entered a new stage in its history. On the other, if flows from the unfortunate fact that human civilization has created extremely efficient means of self-destruction. "For the worst to happen does not even require unprecedented stupidity of criminality," M.S. Gorbachev stressed. "It is enough to act as people have acted for millennia -- to rely on weapons and military force and on occasion, use it in resolving international affairs. It is these millennial traditions that we must now ruthlessly break and renounce for good."

What has been said may look to some people (bourgeois propaganda most often presents things this way) like utopia, like a romantic dream. In reality, it is the only possible formula for mankind's survival in our age. The impossibility [nevozmozhnost] of nuclear war is, in fact, even recognized (in words, alas, not backed by actions) by the U.S. Administration. Does this mean that the problem is no longer so acute and that we will soon be embarking on something that has never been done before -- the destruction of nuclear weapons together with the sharp reduction of all other types of weapons and the shutdown of laboratories and enterprises working on the militarization of space? No, it doesn't. One day it will come -- it cannot fail to come, otherwise all of us people without exception will disappear -- but we are going to have to fight for it desperately.

Yes, we are optimists and we believe in good sense -- in particular, we believe that the proposals set out in M.S. Gorbachev's 15 January statement will be assessed correctly by the U.S. side and we will eventually receive an appropriate answer to them. But we are not lulling ourselves or painting rosy pictures. The age dictates, it is true, but that does not mean we are suddenly going to start reaching agreement with the Washington leaders about everything right away.

Let us ask two interconnected questions. What is the United States? And what does it mean to reach agreement with it? As to the United States: According to official statistics, this year the number of U.S. millionaires will reach 1 million. A million millionaires! A rich country? Yes, very. And a very poor country at the same time because, in addition to that marvelous million, there are 40 million people (U.S. trade union figures) living in the same country who vegetate in permanent poverty. The country's politics and its public opinion are naturally determined by that million who have plenty and who hold the power.

Can we reach agreement with that million on matters which concern good and evil, justice and honor? We have too different a way of looking at many important and serious things.

By way of a most recent example, I might cite the events occurring in Haiti, which are almost like a movie or a play in terms of drama and explosive expressiveness. Even before reading Graham Green's "The Comedians" we were aware of the baseness and the bloody bacchanalia being perpetrated on that island. We were also aware that the tyrant Duvalier clan with its Tonton Macoutes was able to torment the Haitians only because it enjoyed the protection of Washington. It used to be the same in Nicaragua, except that there the U.S. pocket puppet-bandits bore the Somoza family name.

Now Haiti's time has come, I can clearly see the books, films, and plays of the future describing in every detail how Duvalier was flown out by U.S. military transport to a refuge somewhere in France. Let us see what official Washington will now do in Haiti and how soon it will recover from the shock and horror and start to blame Marxists -- Soviet, Cuban, and yet others -- for everything that has happened.

Here is a vivid example of how we look at life in different ways. In our country, when they learned about what was happening in Haiti, people boiled over and burned with hatred. In the United States not only those with power, but those who just had plenty looked on the unhappy island with complete equanimity.

So, is there no hope of reaching an understanding? It depends. M.S. Gorbachev talked about it very simply, without unnecessary metaphors or uncritical [dezhurnyy] optimism, in his answers to L'HUMANITE. The possibility of reaching agreement exists. On the main, fundamental problem which has already been mentioned and on which we are still divided by a gulf. Without building any illusions, however, it is possible to imagine how both sides can strive -- not immediately, obviously, but by insisting and bargaining -- to overcome the gulf and fill it with a mutual understanding. The nuclear danger threatens both the 40 million U.S. paupers and the 1 million millionaires equally.

These are harsh words, but realistic and I hope they will be taken as such. Because it must be understood that M.S. Gorbachev's answers to the questions from L'HUMANITE continue in the most practical way to blaze the trail toward the kind of understanding outlined in the 15 January statement.

U.S. NUCLEAR TESTS SEEN AS 'STUMBLING BLOCK'

LD1423120 Moscow World Service in English 2110 GMT 14 Feb 86

[Commentary by APN press agency's Spartak Beglov]

[Excerpts] The general secretary of the Soviet Communist Party Central Committee, Mikhail Gorbachev, has again said it's impermissible to delay a ban on all nuclear explosions. He said as much in messages to the mayors of Hiroshima and Nagasaki and to a group of Swedish antiwar organizations. Our commentary has been prepared by Spartak Beglov of the APN press Agency:

Let's scrutinize the existing situation once again. For 7 years the world has been literally one step distant from the simplest and at the same time, highly important move to curb the arms race; namely, a ban on all nuclear explosions, including underground explosions. In all these 17 years it has been impossible to do this through the fault of one side. A draft treaty was virtually finished at the end of 1979, but in 1980 the United States demanded suspending the talks, referring to political circumstances as an excuse. In 1982 it walked out altogether. Now, the United States carried out in Nevada half as many underground nuclear explosions in the first half of 1982 as in the whole of the previous year. This alone made it clear that the United States had walked out not on political grounds, but exclusively for military purposes. Since then the American position has remained unchanged. Washington has been unwilling to stop underground explosions and it does not want to join the unilateral moratorium that the Soviet Union set on these explosions on 6 August last year.

So, there's just one stumbling block in the way of stopping nuclear blasts. The United States keeps improving nuclear weapons. Over the months since the Soviet Union announced its unilateral moratorium the United States has carried out seven nuclear explosions underground, for instance to develop laser weapons for the "star wars" projects. This is why Washington does not want to stop underground nuclear explosions.

WEEKLY 'INTERNATIONAL OBSERVERS ROUNDTABLE'

LD162017 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1230 GMT 16 Feb 86

["International Observers Roundtable" program with Aleksandr Yevgeniyevich Bovin, IZVESTIYA political observer; Nikolay Vladimirovich Shishlin, political observer; and Viktor Nikolayevich Levin, All-Union Radio commentator]

[Text] [Levin] Hello, esteemed comrade listeners! Exactly 1 month ago, on 16 January, the newspapers of the whole world -- and that is no exaggeration -- published a statement by Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee. Radio and television broadcast the statement 1 day earlier, on the 15th, which was when it appeared. Now that a certain period of time has elapsed, it would be very worthwhile for us to take a look at the reaction throughout the world to the ideas contained in Comrade Gorbachev's statement. First of all, however, I would like to remind you of what the Soviet proposals were essentially about. Briefly speaking, our country suggested that we reach the 21st century without nuclear and chemical weapons. Here I would also like to recall that the Soviet Union, as an example, a vivid example, of its political will, decided to extend its unilateral moratorium on nuclear explosions until March 31 in the hope that the United States would join in with us. Those proposals, as you all know, are being widely discussed throughout the world at various government levels.

[Shishlin] The idea of saving mankind from nuclear weapons and preventing the arms race from being extended into space is such a substantial one that it somehow overshadows other very important aspects of the statement by Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev. These include the elimination of barbarous chemical weapons and, of course, the Soviet Union's readiness to substantially lower the level of so-called conventional weapons which, due to progress in military technology, are beginning to acquire the characteristics of mass destruction weapons. Here I am talking about conventional weapons in the very broadest sense of the word. But what you were saying about the questions being raised in the West regarding the statement by the CPSU Central Committee general secretary is quite right, and they are questions of a twofold nature. On the one hand are the questions prompted by the desire to understand, to comprehend the Soviet position and define what it is; and on the other hand there are the questions that are put simply to complicate things unnecessarily; questions which, more than anything else, reflect the absence of any constructive ideas on the part of those who raise them. Take, for instance, the question of ending nuclear tests. When the Soviet Union stopped all its nuclear explosions and announced a unilateral moratorium, what the United States said was that the Soviet Union had already carried out its nuclear tests, and that the United States had a program which they had not yet completed.

[Levin] Nikolay Vladimirovich, I would like to back up what you have been saying with the following example: Recently at the disarmament conference in Geneva, a speech was delivered by the Swedish representative, Ambassador Britt Theorin. Referring to information produced by the Swedish center for defense research, she said the center had calculated that from 1945 through 1985 more than 1,500 nuclear weapons tests had been carried out in the world. The precise figure was 1,567. The dismal leader in this competition, she said, was the United States, which carried out 801 explosions. According to the calculations by the Swedish center, the Soviet Union carried out 563 nuclear explosions; France, 135; Great Britain, 38; and China 29. I would like you to focus your attention, comrade listeners, on the figures for the United States and the Soviet Union: 801 and 563, respectively. This makes any talks about the United States somehow lagging behind completely groundless, and I would say that this is known by sober-minded people in the United States.

As an example, I would refer to an article in THE NEW YORK TIMES which says frankly that we have no excuse today for rejecting the new moratorium. The advantage of such a ban is evident: It would be the first concrete step in the process of arms control which could result in other moratoriums, and then a firm accord providing for inspections and other precautionary measures. It has to be said that the administration, however, has no desire to make any concessions at all in this matter· at least to date we have seen nothing positive from the United States in response to the Soviet initiative in putting a moratorium on nuclear explosions.

[Shishlin] It would appear that the United States should be saying now: Well, yes, we have been carrying out tests, but the Soviet Union is not carrying out tests. So, it is time to come to an agreement. But no, a different argument is used: What about the question of monitoring· how do you verify? The Soviet Union says that it is essentially ready for all-embracing surveillance measures over the end of nuclear weapons tests, including on-site surveillance. The Soviet Union furthermore states its positive attitude toward the nonaligned countries' idea of extending the well-known 1963 treaty banning nuclear tests in the three media to include underground nuclear tests. But, on this, the United States maintains a stony silence. The United States says that what is needed are corresponding talks and corresponding accords.

The Soviet Union, in its statement back in January, says that it is ready to sit down immediately at the negotiating table together with the United States and Great Britain, but we are now in the middle of February and there still has been no reply from the United States and Great Britain to the proposal to embark on those talks. But the problem of nuclear tests itself, of course, has become a test of the West's political good will, because it is the kind of problem whose solution would immediately have an effect both on the political climate and the atmosphere at the talks on various levels and on various disarmemnet problems that are being held between us and the United States, and between the socialist and the Western countries.

[Bovin] The whole world is saying enough is enough. It is time something was done. Look how many proposals the Soviet Union has made. No, say the Americans, we are going to carry on. We need to test our nuclear weapons. They have already abandoned all their little demagogic statement about verification and are coming straight out with -- and these are no longer the generals, but the politicians -- straight out with the honest truth and saying: We need to test our new nuclear weapons. That is all there is to it, and we will carry out nulcear tests.

[Levin] Yet we have heard numerous calls from the West for us -- because we speak about our peaceloving intentions -- to back them up with concrete action and make some sort of gesture. Many people in West, and I would call them deluded in good faith, used to say that if one of the great powers were to embark on unilateral disarmament, it would induce the other power to embark on the same path without fail. But, we assumed a very concrete pledge to end nuclear explosions, and we in actuality gave the Americans time not only for thought, but also to complete their series of tests. And what was the result?

[Shishlin] I think Aleksandr Yevgenyevich once said that to test the United States, the sort of step one could take could be to agree to some U.S. ideas, or to part of those ideas, and propose them to the United States, whereupon the United States immediately turns its back on them.

[Bovin] Let us take Europe, and specifically medium-range missiles. Judging by what the U.S. press says, quoting the British and French press -- a rather complicated maneuver -- the Americans are saying this: We in fact would welcome your proposal to completely do away with the missiles with open arms, but it is our allies, you know, who do not want to.

Britain and France, as you know, comrades, are an indispensable element of our proposal. The second thing is that we are ready to remove all our SS-20 missiles from Europe in exchange for the Americans removing theirs, but on the condition that the Americans do not sell their allies new, modernized missile weaponry. What this means specifically is that the British intend to replace the Polaris missiles on their submarines with Trident missiles, which the United States is to supply. But the same thing, the United States says: Yes, in principle we are in favor of removing the missiles, but we still have to supply the new missiles, otherwise relations with our allies will be upset, and so on. In other words, what we have is that when it is a matter of general terms, they say: Yes, your proposal looks alright. We will have to think about it and discuss it. But as soon as you get down to concrete detail, then reservations immediately appear. Because it would not be right simply to say no, they take some sort of roundabout way; but then in the end the answer is no all the same, just as it is now, for example, in Europe.

[Levin] True, I would say that, if one is speaking of the French and British positions, I get the impression that they are not absolutely identical. I have in mind the speech by French President Mitterrand, in which he answered questions from the Here and Now Clubs. In his speech there is a general appraisal of the situation. In particular, Mitterrand stressed that it must never be forgotten -- and these are his words -- that disarmament takes priority over armament for France.

[Bovin] Well, yes.

[Levin] That is the general postulate, but here is what Mitterrand had to say specifically: In the final analysis, we would agree to take part in talks on disarmament, if, first, the nuclear forces of the Soviet Union and the United States are considerably reduced. I am not referring to any numbers, because it does not befit me to refer to any numbers. On this matter there is a clear-cut proposal by the Soviet Union, a proposal for a 50 percent reduction in the first stage. The second conditions was that conventional, chemical, and all the other types of weapons are taken into account at the same time as nuclear weapons. Incidentally, this also is contained in Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev's statement of 15 January.

[Bovin] I support such a stern and realistic view of life. It is very pleasant for me, of course, to hear what you have just read from Mr Mitterrand's speech. But I nevertheless am convinced that if one goes on from these pleasant-sounding general declarations to specific deeds, things are not, I think, at all as pleasing as we would like. Indeed, the French will go on modernizing their nuclear forces, and I have the impression -- and this is being said quite clearly -- that at the present time there can be no question of a freeze. They are saying: Sometime, later, when there is this 50 percent, then we shall consider it. This means that they are automatically barring the way to removing Soviet and U.S. medium-range missiles from Europe.

[Levin] Unfortunately, one cannot fail to agree with that.

[Bovin] No, indeed. Let me mention what Rogers, the commander in chief of NATO's forces in Europe said recently -- I think it was the day before yesterday...

[Levin, interrupting] Yes, it was in NEUE OSNABRUECKER ZEITUNG.

[Bovin] He said: What is the discussion about? Europe needs Pershing missiles and Europe needs U.S. cruise missiles. He said: What disarmament can there be? What zero option can there be? Even what the United States itself was proposing at one time does not suit him.

[Levin] But he is well aware that when they made their proposals it was with dishonest intentions and not in order to reach agreement, but rather to create an impression.

[Bovin] He needs the missiles and that is all. He has said so distinctly. That is the real position that the politicians sometimes attempt to draw a veil over and to dress up in all kinds of words, while the general blurts out the truth, so to speak.

[Levin] But his own truth, which is altogether in the present-day world meeting with mounting resistance.

[Bovin] Unfortunately, however, it is not meeting with resistance in either the White House or the Pentagon.

[Levin] Yes, that is certainly so. But in this connection I would like to mention the position of China, which is also a nuclear power.

[Bovin] China's position is as follows, and, incidentally, is an interesting point. there are two special assistants to the President and the secretary of state on disarmament questions, namely the well-known Paul Nitze and Edward Rowny. Well, Nitze went to Europe and Rowny to Asia for consultations -- as it was put -- with allies and friends, precisely on the subject of the Soviet proposals. Rowny visited China in order to consult with China about the Soviet statement. Well, I have the impression that in general, he was not given a very warm welcome in Beijing. After all, the Chinese are opposed, for example, to the "star wars" program, to which the Americans are tenaciously clinging. The Chinese are in principle, so to speak, in favor of disarmament, at some time or other, at any rate. However, they more or less regard us and the Americans as being on a par. You disarm, they say, and then we will see. This is approximately their position, the Chinese reiterated during the talks in Beijing with Rowny. These talks were very brief, it is true, as he was only there for 1 day.

[Levin] Han Xu, China's ambassador to the United States, gave an interview to the Japanese ASAHI. The Washington correspondent of this important Japanese newspaper asked outright how China regards the Soviet proposals for the elimination of nuclear weapons before the end of the century, and -- going on to mention what you were saying about the equal responsibility of the Soviet Union and the United States, the Chinese ambassador said that, if the United States and the USSR really intend to eliminate nuclear armaments, they should first of all make reductions of 50 percent in their nuclear arsenals. Once it is convinced that this has been achieved, China, we reckon, will be able to sit down at the negotiating table to discuss a reduction in its own nuclear armaments.

[Bovin] Compared with the stand adopted several years ago under Mao Tse-tung, this is certainly some kind of improvement. Let us hope that this is what will happen.

[Levin] Yes, but for the moment...

[Bovin, interrupting] The important thing is for them to tell the United States that they should agree to a 50 percent disarmament! That is the problem.

[Levin] For the moment, nevertheless, we are quite right to note, and justifiably note, that the 15 January statement by Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, was not only addressed to the United States, it was addressed to the whole world. But at present it is evident...

[Bovin, interrupting] Nevertheless, it was, of course mainly addressed to the United States.

[Levin] And we are awaiting a response from the United States. But along with these questions that are being amassed by the United States, its political line, after all, is also continuing to instill very great alarm. Take just the recent U.S. actions, that is to say, its foreign policy actions.

[Bovin] We are, of course, presently seeing, I would say, this very unrestrained and, perhaps I might say, emphatically impudent policy with regard, for instance, to Libya, where the United States has been traveling backwards and forwards daily in the Mediterranean. They have aircraft carriers there and aircraft. They are really trying to intimidate Libya, but they are doing so in vain.

[Levin] One U.S. journalist, explaining these nonstop provocative actions by the U.S. military off Libya's shores, has written outright that the task is to infuriate Libya and provoke her into some ill-considered action. This would thereby provide a pretext for the United States to resort to the use of military force on a broad scale against that independent state. Why is this? It is because Libya is not to the United States' liking and its anti-imperialist foreign policy -- which muddles up the United States' cards in the Near and Middle East -- is not to the United States liking. It is precisely for this reason that the United States does not disdain such measures, although in this regard it has recourse through various attempts to justify such actions by references to terrorism. But this so-called terrorism on Libya's part is in no way confirmed. At the same time, the United States' partner, ally, and lieutenant in the Near East, Israel, is perpetrating one terrorist act after another. Just recall the recent forced landing of a Libyan aircraft on Israeli territory. That was a glaring act of state terrorism.

[Bovin] Take Savimbi, whom the United States has just received. Well, he is fairly well-known figure, but from the viewpoint of, say, Reagan, Savimbi is altogether a person who should not evoke his particular sympathy. But, in order to spite the Angolan Government, the Cubans, and ourselves, they will make a fuss over this Savimbi and will provide him with money and weapons only to...

[Levin, interrupting] He is received in the White House, too.

[Bovin] Yes, only in order to play a dirty trick on the lawful Government of Angola. It is the same story with Nicaragua. In this regard, it is characteristic that in all these cases the United States is supporting rebels who are acting against lawful governments, with which -- not with all of them, but with some of which -- the United States has normal diplomatic relations. Take Afghanistan and take Nicaragua; they have ambassadors and diplomats resident in those countries. At the same time, the United States is backing people who are acting against these governments. There you have their policy.

[Levin] And where as yet there is no acute situation and where there exists a more or less normal situation, as for example in the Korean peninsula, the United States is trying to exacerbate the situation. Take the "Team Spirit" maneuvers. They are plainly intended to step up tension in the region and create a further hotbed of tension.

[Bovin] There is, of course, alas, nothing good coming from these maneuvers. From the viewpoint of this matter, the Chinese too have said that it is time to terminate the maneuvers, and North Korea also has proposed that this be done. No, once again the United States stubbornly refused. They will hold the maneuvers.

[Shishlin] If one looks at the U.S. President's message on the administration's legislative initiatives for fiscal 1982, then there is once again the foundation of a program for building up medium-range nuclear arms, not to mention strategic arms, the production of MX missiles, the production of Midgetman missiles, and others. But there is a great deal at stake. In actual fact, in fate of the whole process of smoothing out international relations is at stake. At stake is the fate of that task, which to me is the key task for 1986: the task of really reducing the level of military confrontation, the task of really overcoming those most painful, most complex problem areas which have an extremely bad effect on the whole world situation and on Soviet-U.S. relations in particular.

[Levin] If we are to talk, so to speak, of definite prospects, then what is at stake is the fate of mankind. So, of course, the situation in the world remains complicated and tense.

[Bovin] Well, someone said this: What is the difference in the world before Geneva and after Geneva? Before Geneva it was a world of confrontation, and now it is a world of confrontation with a dialogue. Well, that is also a good thing. Yes, a dialogue has begun between the United States and us and incidentally, it is continuing. Take the signing of the agreement on airplane flights. Some things will have to do with cultural exchanges and then there will be something else. These are all useful and necessary things. Some things, of course, continue to move along slowly. But confrontation remains in questions of politics and principle and we, comrades, should see this clearly. We want to perceive the world not through the prism of some kind of illusory notions, but as it is per se. We will do everything to improve the situation and use the opportunities which exist. But, we must look at things realistically.

[Levin] Many complexities remain and of course this includes the issue that was raised in the 15 January declaration by Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev on the need for a new way of thinking.

[Shishlin] Definitely. And in this respect, it seems to me that the United States simply does not yet fully understand and maybe has not at all come to understand that the nuclear age does indeed require a new way of thinking. It really does require a breaking away from those usual norms of relationships and methods of solving all kinds of conflicts that have been used by countries, nations, and people throughout the thousands of years of mankind's history.

[Levin] This appeared very clearly, particularly in the speeches of Secretary of Defense Weinberger on the Pentagon draft budget for the next fiscal year. He just repeats the old thesis that only force can guarantee the security of the United States, although experience now very clearly shows that force undermines security and we have to renounce these ideas, ideas which are, generally speaking, from the Stone Age.

[Bovin] Well, for example, if you have read Western scientific lieterature, what is being written by learned men, English, American, French, they have been working on this problem for a long time. They think in a new way. They are analyzing all this in a new way now, taking account of the realities of the nuclear age. But on the level of the politicians and of official administrations, well, of course, hold-ups occur there because the new way of thinking basically requires a major psychological change, a major intellectual change. It is such a high barrier. Here in this case, the U.S. Administration is incapable of getting over this barrier, even though in American literature, in newspapers and magazines, on the level of journalists, you can find as many common-sense, considered, intelligent thoughts as you like coming precisely from the new realities. But on the level of government, unfortunately, we are not yet seeing this, or we perhaps see only the beginnings, so to speak, of this.

When Reagan says that war cannot be won, now that is indeed an element of the new thinking. But unfortunately he does not draw all the conclusions he should from this statement. That is where the problem lies. Things stop in mid-thought and he gets stuck somewhere in the stagnant, traditional, old ideas.

[Shishlin] The value of the Soviet statement and the value of the recent speeches which develop and clarify those ideas contained in the statement -- and these clarifications were made by Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev -- is precisely that the Soviet position considers not only the security interests of the Soviet Union but, to the same extent, the security interests of the United States and the security interests of other states. The sum of ideas that is contained in this statement has been formed from many points of view and the comparison of different points of view that were expressed throughout the last months of very intense political work, which was carried out in our mutual relations with different states, and first and foremost the socialist, nonaligned countries, and the developed capitalist states. In itself, this new approach to international relations will, of course, I understand, come up against the force of inertia, the force of habit and the force of traditional relations, but we have made the whole world speak of our ideas. A very full, important, and vital political struggle around these ideas has gotten underway. Not only people on a governmental level invested with a certain political authority are getting involved in this struggle, but the peoples are getting involved in this struggle and this, of course, is extremely important.

[Levin] Our task is to make sure that these ideas, these elements of new thinking without which mankind is simply doomed, are implemented. Our policy, and all the efforts of our party and our state, are concentrated on this. But the struggle before us is, it cannot be denied, a dogged, complex political struggle. We will go our part of the way. There is no doubt about that. We demonstrate this not only in words but also in concrete actions. Not everything in the world depends on us, and our friends and allies who fully support us in this cause. As an example, I would like to refer to an interview which Comrade Jaruzelski, the leader of Poland, gave to Italian television. The point is that the Italian television correspondent asked the question directly: What do you think of the proposals of Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev concerning disarmament? Here is Comrade Jaruzelski's reply:

I consider these proposals to be, first, very wise; second, very bold; and third, very honest. It is a good thing that these proposals have not shared the fate of other earlier advanced proposals, that they were not rejected out of hand, but are being analyzed by the Western partners. It is important that we should all watch out that the analysis of these proposals is not deftly sidetracked and that the initiative is not put in doubt in any way. That would be a great loss.

That is the assessment of Comrade Jaruzelski. That is how he assesses the West's reaction, and it is a very realistic assessment.

[Shishlin] The fate of the ideas advanced by the Soviet Union depends, of course, in certain measure on the way in which Soviet-U.S. relations will develop, but not just on Soviet-U.S. relations. In this regard, of course, Europe can and must play its part in the improvement of international relations. It seems to me to be significant that our dialogue, the Soviet Union's dialogue with the European countries, has perciptibly been intensifying over all these past months, and in this respect, 1986 promises to be a particularly abundant year insofar as Moscow will be receiving senior politicians from the Western European states, and of course, our statesmen will have the opportunity to hold talks with the West European countries. We can naturally expect that in this European voice the ideas that are being worked out and generated by the socialist countries acting jointly will of course resonate appreciably.

The positive trend toward strengthening the coordiantion of actions of the socialist states, actions, which emerged so manifestly last year, will undoubtedly be consolidated in 1986. It is a substantial factor.

[Levin] With that, comrades, we come to the end of our program today. All the best to you. Thank you for your attention.

MELNIKOV COMMENTS ON UN HUMAN RIGHTS MEETING

PM181005 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 15 Feb 86 First Edition p 5

[Igor Melnikov "Commentator's Column": "For Human Rights"]

[Text] The UN Human Rights Commission is now at work in Geneva. The very fact that this session is the 42d to date demonstrates the world community's constant interest in this problem.

Anyone who follows that forum's work will be more strongly convinced that year by year its content increasingly reflects the growing desire of most states' governments and of the international public that efforts be focused on maintaining peace. The present session also confirms taht safeguarding each person's fundamental right -- the right to life -- is the most important and necessary condition for realizing the whole spectrum of rights.

Life shows that in many parts of the world people are still being subjected to inhuman treatment and deprived of their elementary rights and freedoms. And this is happening where capital is king. Loud propaganda campaigns about imaginary violations of freedoms in the socialist countries are organized to divert attention from those facts and are based on fabrications. Meanwhile, the most flagrant human rights violations in the Israeli-occupied Arab territories, in Chile, and southern Africa feature on the agenda of successive UN Commission sessions.

This demonstrates, on the one hand, the world community's steadfast determination to remove the centers of racism and racial discrimination and put an end to the dissemination of neo-Nazi ideology. On the other hand, the fact that acute problems remain unsolved indicates that racist and dictatorial regimes owe their "vitality" to generous financial sops, political support, and sometimes simply the bayonets of U.S. imperialism. In this context how can one forget Grenada, whose sovereignty was trampled by the U.S. assault forces' boots? So in the Palais des Nations now the pulloried Pinochet butchers, the champions of the apartheid policy in southern Africa. and the Israeli occupiers gloating over their victims will be accompanied invisibly by their patrons -- U.S. and West European financiers, owners of international monopolies, arms dealers and reactionary politicians.

The session in Geneva will examine questions of safeguarding socioeconomic rights. This problem has now become particularly acute -- the imperialist monopolies' predatory policy has doomed hundreds of millions of people to starvation and meant that entire countries cannot eliminate backwardness and poverty. Ways of combating attempts to revive Nazi ideology and a number of other topical problems will also be discussed. The important work to defend human rights in the mofern troubled world goes on.

PRAVDA EXAMINES SOVIET-U.S. TRADE RELATIONS

PM171648 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 15 Feb 86 First Edition p 4

[Own correspondent A. Tolkunov article: "Time To Break Down the Barriers: U.S. Business Against Trade Discrimination"]

[Text] New York, 14 February -- At 3d Avenue and 46th Street in the very center of Manhattan stands the headquarters of Amtorg [American Trade Joint Stock Company]. It is dominated by lively business activity: Meetings and talks with representatives of U.S. firms are held here. Their requests are examined and companies are sought to carry out Soviet orders on mutually beneficial terms.

"We have established contacts with almost 250 U.S. firms," Amtorg Chairman Yu. Shcherbina said. "We not only do the ground work for the fulfillment of Soviet foreign trade organizations' requests but often sign the contracts, too.

The more than 60 years' activity of Amtorg, which began operating in New York as a joint stock company on 23 May 1924, provides an instructive chapter in the history of Soviet-U.S. cooperation. In the early seventies economic ties expanded to mutual benefit. But, as in the cold war period, all any administration had to do was set about sharply exacerbating the international situation and impose "restrictions" and "embargoes" on trade with the Soviet Union for this to immediately boomerang on U.S. business.

"Just look at how many artificial obstacles, restrictions, and different embargoes have been placed recently in the way of one contract or another," my interlocutor continued. "Take machinery and equipment, for example. There are many bans on their purchase and the acquisition of licenses. And yet it must be clear to any intelligent person that given the modern development of science and technology and the present level of the international division of labor there must be trade in this equipment. Or just take the ban on the supply of spare parts for certain types of previously acquired equipment. For that reason many of our customers in the Soviet Union were forced to look elsewhere for more reliable suppliers."

Late December 1981 came to mind. It was a dismal Christmas in Peoria, Illinois, where the Caterpillar company enterprises are located. The company had only just announced massive new layoffs. How opportune a profitable contract would have been then! But it was not to be. On the pretext of events in Poland which, by the way, were a purely internal matter for the Poles, the White House announced another "embargo." It also affected Caterpillar's delivery to the USSR of pipe-laying equipment under a contract already signed. Here is what I heard at that time from Caterpillar representative R. Newhouse:

"Unfortunately this will mean the dismissal of hundreds of our workers and employees. Furthermore, we shall lose our reputation as a reliable partner. And the order will clearly go to Japan."

That is indeed what happened. Mass layoffs began in Peoria. And the order was given to the Japanese company Komatsu. As the ignominious failure of the sanctions on the supply of equipment for the Urengoy-Pomary-Uzhgorod gas pipeline showed, the allies by no means always want to follow the White House's lead.

Our country is committed to a completely different approach. And this was reemphasized during the recent meeting of the American-Soviet Trade and Economic Council (ASTEC) in Moscow.

"We have very great plans," M.S. Gorbachev said to those taking part in the meeting, "for the development of our economy, science, and technology. And we would like to make maximum use to that end of the additional opportunities provided by international cooperation, including with the United States."

In the course of the Moscow meeting the U.S. businessmen, the most representative delegation in recent years, saw for themselves the opportunities that are opening up for cooperation with the Soviet Union. In their opinion the activation of trade and economic ties became possible after the Geneva summit when real prospects appeared for improving relations between our countries. At the same time it is patently obvious, ASTEC President J. Giffen stated, that trade is a two-way street and benefits both sides.

It is important, of course, that everyone in the United States understand that the USSR, itself a leader in a number of areas, is not a market for obsolete goods and will only buy that which meets high world standards. If the United States continues its present policy the Soviet Union will produce what it needs by itself or will obtain it in other countries.

"Together with American firms," Yu. Shcherbina continued, "we are now examining the possibility of carrying out over 30 major joint projects. In this connection around 20 requests and suggestions, some of them in the sphere of the power industry, the chemical industry, machine building, and the development of our agroindustrial complex, have been received since the December ASTEC session. We are finding many problems, however. After all, the traditional ties with U.S. companies had been broken off for many long years and you cannot rebuild them in a day. Against the background of the frenzied anti-Soviet campaign a number of firms were forced to close down departments that dealt with us. Now we are trying, with our U.S. partners, to restore the broken links. But it is no easy matter.

...I looked through the list of manufacturing equipment and licenses sold to the United States recently with Amtorg's active assistance. Companies such as Reynolds, Kaiser Aluminum, and Alcoa have acquired Soviet technology for casting aluminum in a magnetic field. Texas Utilities have bought technology for the underground gasification of coal and MacDermott acquired contact welding technology. Multi Arc Vacuum bought Soviet pressure coating technology and equipment, and Air Products and Chemicals acquired air fractionating equipment. And in March this year the flow lines of Medical Technology Development, a medical equipment plant in Clearwater, Florida, will begin producing the world's most sophisticated scalpels for eye microsurgery and other instruments and equipment ranging from artificial silicone crystals to computer programs capable of measuring and evaluating the extent of eye damage and of providing advice to surgeons. Eye microsurgery equipment and instruments developed and created at the Moscow eye microsurgery scientific research institute and now produced under license in the United States will help restore many Americans' sight. These examples show that there are things for U.S. companies to buy in the USSR.

However, the administration continues to act to the detriment of U.S. business. For example, scarcely had the ASTEC session ended when U.S. Secretary of State G. Shultz again stated that official Washington has no intention of reviewing the discriminatory trade barriers against the Soviet Union. Furthermore, new moves are being made toward making the conditions of economic, scientific, and technical cooperation more rigid. As though on someone else's orders the Pentagon is publishing a series of "reports" on the undermining of U.S. national security if scientific and technical ties between our countries are expanded.

American business expects a different approach from the administration. Here are a few examples. For 40 years now Amtorg has maintained business ties between Soviet foreign trade organizations and one of America's largest companies, Du Pont de Nemours.

For example, the latter acquired from the Soviet Union a pharmaceutical preparation called ethmosene, used in the struggle against cardiovascular disease. Du Pont, in turn, offers chemical products. "We have always viewed the Soviet Union as a reliable partner and express the firm desire to expand our mutually beneficial trade and economic ties," company Vice President C. Demartino told me.

M. Kallen, vice president of Monsanto, shares that opinion. For 25 years that major chemical company has been trading with the Soviet Union. "Trade with your country," M. Kallen believes, "is very profitable for us. That is why we are now examining plans for expanding cooperation through 1990."

Many U.S. politicians are aware of the benefit of expanding trade and economic ties on the one hand and the harmful consequences of the different restrictions on the other. "I have long been worried that the United States has become a country that very often harms itself in trade," Texas Senator L. Bentsen felt compelled to admit in a letter addressed to Commerce Secretary M. Baldrige. In that context he cited the following fact. Prior to the embargo on the supply of petroleum equipment to the Soviet Union the United States took 35 percent of that expanding market. Now that figure is down to just 0.4 percent. Between 1979 and 1983 alone the United States lost orders worth more than $1.7 billion. The USSR obtained the equipment it needed in other countries or began producing it by itself.

However, it is not just a question of petroleum and gas equipment deliveries. According to U.S. Department of Commerce figures, each R1 billion of U.S. exports creates an extra 25,000 jobs.

In the opinion of W. Verity, member of the Armco board of directors, the expansion of trade would undoubtedly help to improve relations between our countries and create the political climate for confidence.

Voices in favor of such a development are also being heard in Washington. In practice, however, its moves are not only far removed from the joint commitments in Geneva, including on the development of trade and economic ties, but at times directly contradict them. The visit to Amtorg, however, confirms how necessary it is to be faithful in deeds not words to those commitments if we are to serve both countries' interests and strive to normalize the international situation.

## NAVAL EXERCISES CONFIRM U.S. 'STATE TERRORISM'

PM141709 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 14 Feb 86 First Edition p 5

[Own correspondent V. Gan dispatch under the general heading "State Terrorism"]

[Text] Washington, 13 Feb -- With the resumption of provocative U.S. military maneuvers in the central Mediterranean the situation has again grown dangerously heated. American officials acknowledge that two U.S. Navy strike groupings headed by the aircraft carriers Coral Sea and Saratoga have been ordered to carry out "the most obvious gunboat diplomacy" to intimidate Libya. Judging by press articles, the top echelons of the administration are seriously considering delivering "punitive strikes" against Libyan installations. THE WASHINGTON POST writes today that the U.S. Joint Chiefs of Staff have drafted and endorsed plans to bomb Libya using the naval squadron assembled close to Libya's territorial waters. However, for quite obvious reasons the United States would not want to appear to be the "instigator" of military conflict. Therefore, correspondents here are remarking, it is counting on embroiling Libya in confrontation.

It is expected that this demonstration of U.S. "military muscle" will reach a critical stage in March, when the participants in the present acts of provocation are joined by the aircraft carrier America. With the arrival of reinforcements, the Pentagon intends to extend the maneuvers right up to the Gulf of Sidra, which Libya considers its own territorial waters.

Is it worth saying that America's disgraceful actions regarding an independent country are way out of line with international law, confirming yet again that state terrorism is an integral part of the American administration's policy.

HABIB VISIT MAY EXACERBATE PHILIPPINE SITUATION

LD171858 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1548 GMT 17 Feb 86

[From "The World Today" program presented by Igor Kudrin]

[Text] It is not calm in the Philippines where the presidential elections have not relieved the situation. President Marcos does not conceal his satisfaction at his victory and has said that he is prepared to reach a reasonable political compromise with the opposition. But Corazon Aquino, leader of the opposition who was defeated, is trying to dispute the results of voting. She asserts that regulations were violated in the vote counting. In the central square in Manila there was a mass demonstration by Aquino supporters who are threatening to paralyze the country by a general strike.

Washington clearly wishes that passions would subside as quickly as possible and that everything would remain as before; the main thing is that U.S. interests should not suffer and that its military and economic interests should not suffer. This is why Philip Habib, President Reagan's special envoy, has arrived urgently in the Philippines. Incidentally, certain observers think that this visit will not play a peacemaking role, but, on the contrary, will harm and exacerbate the situation still further. In this connection, it is worth recalling the arrival of a group of U.S. observers for the elections, the Pentagon's promise to send military advisers to the Philippines, the U.S. President's words about the particular importance of the U.S. military bases in that country, and finally, the promise to give the Philippines fresh aid if, of course, they continue to respect U.S. interests in the future.

U.S. PLANS IN HAITI BASED ON GRENADA MODEL

LD131930 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1545 GMT 13 Feb 86

[From "The World Today" program presented by Valentin Zorin]

[Text] Reports by the international press agencies attest to the fact that the situation in Haiti remains tense. In various of the country's towns mass demonstrations are taking place, in which the participants are calling for the establishment of a genuinely national government in place of a junta of pro-American puppets. They also want the return to Haiti of the dictator Duvalier, who has fled, his immediate trial, and the confiscation from the Duvalier family of hundreds of millions of dollars stolen from the Haitian people and kept in secret accounts in Swiss banks.

The tone of the U.S. press, in reporting the situation in Haiti, is set by the obvious nervousness in Washington. Having arranged the replacement of the bankrupt tyrant by a junta composed of his associates -- there is no longer any doubt that this was carried out by the U.S. secret services -- Washington hoped to defuse the situation and take the heat out of the rising rebellion, while basically leaving everything else as it was.

The fact that Haiti is only a few dozen kilometers from the shores of socialist Cuba and occupies a strategic position in the Caribbean basin is of decisive importance to Washington. Reports which have found their way into the U.S. press today show that this is the reason why a scenario is being drafted in the U.S. capital to make provision for the fact that events in Haiti could get out of U.S. control -- just in case. And all the indications are that this scenario is being compiled on the model of that for Grenada, presupposing direct intervention by the U.S. Armed Forces in events in the country.

## REAGAN'S VISIT TO GRENADA 'NEW POLITICAL FARCE'

LD151714 Moscow TASS in English 1702 GMT 15 Feb 86

[Text] Havana February 15 TASS -- U.S. President Ronald Reagan is to pay a one-day visit to Grenada next week where he plans to meet leaders of some Caribbean states. In connection with preparations for the visit the White House is mounting a vociferous campaign whose principal goal is to conceal from the world public the true meaning of the new political farce.

The White House alleges that the meeting will give centre stage to "economic" problems. Observers believe, however, with good reason that these contentions are used by Washington only as a cover up for cobbling together a reactionary military-political bloc which would assume the functions of a policeman in that region. It is far from fortuitous that Grenada was chosen as a venue for the meeting, the commentaries point out.

It is exactly this island Caribbean state that became one of the first victims to the U.S. policy of vigorously fanning up regional conflicts and intensifying U.S. intervention in the affairs of other countries, which was epitomised in the so-called "neo-globalism doctrine". In keeping with this imperialist doctrine, the United States wages undeclared wars on Nicaragua, Angola, Afghanistan and other states.

Following the visit of the U.S. president to Barbados in 1982, a division is known to have emerged in the sub-regional association of Caribbean English-speaking states under pressure from Washington on the question of membership in it of revolutionary Grenada. This was soon entailed by the formation of a pro-American bloc led by Jamaica and Barbados and also the establishment on U.S. and British funds of the "regional security and defence system". It was designed by Washington to counteract an upsurge in the national-liberation movement in the region. The rulers of Antigua and Barbuda, Barbados, Dominica and some other Caribbean countries betrayed the interests of their peoples and backed the U.S. gangster invasion of Grenada.

According to the designs of the U.S. Administration, the "Caribbean peace maintenance forces" will become the nucleus of a new military and political bloc that is being hastily knocked together by Washington. To this end, the Pentagon actually converted international airport at Point Salines, work to build which was started under the Maurice Bishop government, into an airforce base. The move, planned by the White House, to "bless" this airport, on whose land the blood of hundreds of innocent people was shed during the U.S. intervention, looks as undisguised cynicism and an insult to the Grenadians' national feelings.

Far from all leaders of Caribbean states were invited to the meeting with Reagan, news agencies point out. For instance, Guyana was passed over in silence. It is understandable that Washington's plans did not include participation in this farce of representatives of a country which condemned the U.S. occupation of Grenada and opposes gross U.S. interference in the internal affairs of other states in the region.

U.S. HUMAN RIGHTS REPORT 'GARISH PROPAGANDA'

LD152032 Moscow TASS in English 2016 GMT 15 Feb 86

[Text] Washington February 15 TASS -- TASS Correspondent Nikolay Orekhov reports:

The U.S. State Department has issued an annual report on human rights practices in various countries of the world over. Yet, already in the first reading of that "research paper" one cannot but note its garish propaganda character. The main efforts of the authors of the report are aimed at trying to justify the cooperation of the USA with the repressive and dictatorial regimes. Simultaneously they are pouring streams of lies and slanders on the states, whose policy does not suit the Washington administration's book.

The political face of the authors of the report is particularly clearly seen when it comes to the issue of Nicaragua. They have collected all the foul inventions and rumours spread by the enemies of the Sandinist revolution, but are at the same time trying to justify the activity of the anti-government gangs of "contras" and relieve them of all charges of making short shrift of the peaceful population. In its zeal the U.S. State Department is trying to call in question even the facts proved by documents of international public organisations and mass media in the United States itself.

The praise lavished in the report on the bloody dictatorship of General Pinochet in Chile is the limit of cynicism. While recognising in a vague form the fact of "restriction of most of the basic political liberties" in that country, State Department experts lay the blame for that on...the Chilean patriots, who are fighting for their homeland's freedom. The State Department is also trying to justify by the same references to "guerrilla actions" the terror perpetrated by the Salvadorean authorities against that country's peaceful population.

An even clumsier attempt is made by the authors of the document at justifying Washington's support for Haitian dictator Duvalier, whose bloody regime had been deposed by the time the report was issued. Citing numerous examples of the violation of human rights by Duvalier and his entourage, the State Department has, nevertheless, found it necessary to praise the dictator hateful to all Haitians for, as is claimed in the report, "reckoning with international opinion".

REPUBLICANS WAGING STRUGGLE FOR REAGAN 'HERITAGE'

LD150315 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1950 GMT 13 Feb 86

[From "The World Today" program presented by Valentin Zorin]

[Text] Together with you, comrades, I would now like to peek behind the political scenes of the U.S. capital.

Only scant information of the unfolding events is penetrating the tightly closed doors of Washington offices; nonetheless, this will have the most vital political consequences. Reports which are being quoted in certain U.S. papers and magazines in recent days are evidence that the struggle for what in the party's ruling clique is called Reagan's heritage is getting under way, and is assuming an increasingly acute nature.

Even though the president in office is holding the reins of government firmly in his hands, powerful forces who determine who is who in the Republican Party are engaged in the search for the politician who will head the Republicans in the next election. According to the Constitution which is in force, Reagan cannot run for a third term. Who will take his place? This question has been thrown in fairly sharp relief already now, even though the elections will not take place until the autumn of 1988. An especially acute struggle on the remote approaches of the presidential campaign has gotten under way in the Republican camp, where every effort is being made to remain the ruling party.

The strongest position, inasmuch as one can judge, is held by George Bush, the present U.S. vice president. His trump card is his position as second man in the administration and the direct access to the levers of power connected with this.

Bush is 62 years old. He is the son of a big banker who at one time held the post of United States senator. Coming from a rich family, he studied in the country's most privileged educational institutions. During World War II he was a pilot and served in the Pacific theater. After the war, using family capital, he founded a petroleum recovery corporation and made a large fortune. After that Bush entered the sphere of politics. After an unsuccessful attempt to become a senator, he eventually secured a place as a member of the House of Representatives. His vigorous support for the aggression in Vietnam caught Richard Nixon's attention. Bush held various senior posts in the Nixon government. He was the U.S. representative at the UN, the chairman of the Republican National Committee, and the chief of a legation in China. After that he was entrusted with the post of director of the Central Intelligence Agency, which he had to leave after Carter became president. At one time George Bush was Reagan's rival in the struggle for the post of president, but then a compromise was reached and he contented himself with the seat of vice president. Both Bush's service record and his present position, it would seem, do not leave his rivals in the Republican Party any chances.

However, in the past few days news has filtered into the press to the effect that influential representatives of the party's ruling clique prefer gambling not on Bush, but on Jack Kemp, 50, a member of the House of Representatives, who is on the extreme right wing of the Republican Party. While the position of the influential and experienced Bush is connected with a long and slow climb up the party hierarchy ladder, Kemp's ascent is considered unexpected by many. This who knew him at the start of his career noted the mediocre capabilities of this politician. Even in the official American reference book "Current Biography," which usually smooths over sharp edges, the following detail is mentioned: He was an extremely poor student, especially in the study of courses of history and other humanitarian sciences. The only thing Kemp excelled in was sports. Indeed, Kemp's initial all-American fame is connected with football. At the end of the forties and beginning of the fifties he was one of the country's best known professional football players. After the end of his sporting career he caught the eye of representatives of the right wing of the Republican Party, who decided to make use of his football popularity for the party's purposes. As a result, Kemp took an active part in the election campaigns of Goldwater, Nixon, and Reagan, for which he was awarded by Reagan with a post in the White House staff. [as heard]

However, as you understand, all this is insufficient for becoming a favorite of influential leaders of the Republican Party.

Kemp's main political trump card is his extreme reactionary attitudes in the sphere both of foreign and domestic policy, attitudes which are so offensive that even such a conservative as Bush, compared to him, is declared to be a liberal by right-wing reactionaries. It is of course early to speak at the present stage of the comparative chances of the candidate for the post of leader of the Republican Party, but the appearance itself of the name of the reactionary Kemp in this list is a sufficiently eloquent fact.

A few other party leaders are also aspiring to the post of president. Mentioned among them are the names of Senator Dole, former Senator Baker, who are ranked as belonging to the political center of the Republican Party, and also the not unknown Jeane Kirkpatrick, who is competing with Kemp for the right to become the favorite of the extreme reactionaries.

Of course, the decisive skirmishes for political leadership are still far off. However, the fact that they are getting under way already now, and the fact of who is aspiring to leadership testify to the acuteness of the internal political situation in the United States, and of that internal struggle that is being waged inside the Washington ruling clique.

## DOUBTS RAISED ON CIVILIAN NATURE OF NEW AIRCRAFT

LD160223 Moscow in English to North America 2300 GMT 15 Feb 86

[Vladimir Kozakov commentary]

[Text] In his recent State of the Union address President Reagan announced another prestigious technological project of his administration. The President said that the United States will go ahead with the development of a new type of aircraft capable of traveling over great distances over a very short time. The President said that by the end of the decade airliners traveling at 25 times the speed of sound will be taking off from ordinary airports to reach a low orbit and then glide to their destination. The President said that the new aircraft, or, as he put it, the Eastern Express, will be used for civilian purposes and among other things for taking passengers from the United States to Japan or any other part of the world.

In its comment on the Presidential address, THE WASHINGTON POST has, however, said that on many occasions in the past the President's (?dream) language appears to have masked a military reality. There are indications that the military have been dreaming of an aircraft of that kind for many years and Air Force pilots would not mind taking a ride in it. The military offer a different interpretation of the purpose of the aircraft. They say that it might be a good idea if the United States Air Force had an aircraft capable of deflying any antiaircraft defense system and delivering nuclear weapons to targets in any part of the world. To those who have followed the United States space program this comes as no surprise. Suffice it to recall the early stages of the shuttle program. The shuttle program, Washington said, is a civilian undertaking financed by NASA, a nonmilitary government agency. The military were waiting in the wings. The shuttle program was from the very beginning tailored to the Pentagon's needs, but this, of course, was something not to be talked about. Many years after the start of the shuttle program it was announced that a third of shuttle missions are to be classified and military.

Following the Challenger disaster it was announced that the three next missions will be postponed. Scientific programs are to be resumed later and missions to study the sun and Jupiter, scheduled for May, are to be postponed for 13 months. The Pentagon, however, is pressing ahead with a military shuttle mission. It looks as though the Pentagon is prepared not only to postpone scientific programs but to cut them short altogether for the sake of its own preparations for "star wars". After the Apollo moon landings scientists were thinking of a mission to Mars, relying on what has been achieved by the Apollo program, These dreams have never materialized and all the projects were called off as too costly. At the same time the Pentagon was clearly thinking of taking over the United States space program. There was some speculation in scientific and political circles that NASA might be closed down. After a long discussion it was decided, however, that NASA should remain. It is becoming increasingly clear that this was done to cover up large-scale military space programs undertaken for ostensibly civilian and scientific purposes. But still every new NASA undertaking is declared civilian.

Let us recall President Reagan's speech announcing the start of work on a permanent space station. That project, too, was declared to be strictly civilian. The Pentagon, however, worked on a project of that kind some 20 years ago. At the time it proved far too complicated but the military continued to think of having astronauts in orbit on a permanent basis for intelligence gathering, communications, testing of space weapons and command purposes. If we look further back into history we recall that work on a stratosphere bomber was in progress in Nazi Germany. German scientists who worked on that project later moved to the United States where they continued their work. The Pentagon has clearly been dreaming of such a system and now it's been announced that the United States is going ahead with the project which, in keeping with tradition, has been declared civilian and exclusively peaceful.

## TRIAL LAUNCH OF U.S. TOMAHAWK MISSILE NOTED

LD160941 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 0004 GMT 16 Feb 86

[Text] Washington, 16 Feb (TASS) -- A representative of the U.S. Department of the Navy has announced that a trial launch of a Tomahawk cruise missile, capable of carrying a nuclear warhead, took place Saturday in the area of the Florida coast. The Pentagon is equipping both submarine and surface vessles of the U.S. Navy with Tomahawks. They have been installed on 20 vessels already at present. The program to develop [razvertyvaniye] land- and air-based cruise missiles is also being carried out in the United States at full speed. The Pentagon is laying no small stake on this type of first-strike weapon in its attempts to disrupt military-strategic parity with the Soviet Union, while pushing the arms race further on.

## ARKHIPOV REPORTEDLY TO VISIT PRC IN MARCH

HK180850 Hong Kong AFP in English 0839 GMT 18 Feb 86

[Excepts] Beijing, Feb 18 (AFP) -- Soviet First Vice-Premier Ivan Arkhipov is to pay an official two-week visit to China next month, a Soviet diplomatic source said here today.

Mr. Arkhipov would be heading a Soviet delegation to a meeting of a Sino-Soviet commission created last July, the source said, adding that the commission each year was to review bilateral economic, scientific and cultural relations.

The exact dates for his visit, due to last about two weeks, had yet to be set, the source said, but observers thought that it would be after the close of the upcoming Soviet Communist Party Congress scheduled to end around mid-March.

## ANNIVERSARY OF AMITY TREATY WITH PRC NOTED

OW151840 Moscow Radio Peace and Progress in Mandarin to China 0400 GMT 15 Feb 86

[Station observer Ivanov commentary]

[Text] Dear listeners, a Soviet-Chinese treaty of friendship, alliance, and mutual assistance was signed 36 years ago on 24 February 1950. In this connection, our station observer on foreign affairs Ivanov has the following to say:

Both the Soviet and the Chinese people warmly welcomed the signing of this treaty. A 1,000-strong rally was held in Beijing on 18 February 1950. It was pointed out there that Soviet-Chinese friendship and cooperation were of great significance for safeguarding and consolidating the PRC's independence and developing its economy and scientific and technological undertakings. Based on this treaty, agreements on bilateral trade and economic, scientific, technological, and other exchanges were signed.

In fulfilling the obligations stipulated in the treaty, the Soviet Union supplied China with everything it needed. To help China overcome difficulties during its rehabilitation period and smash the U.S. imperialists' conspiracy to strangle the young republic with a blockade, our two countries conducted, on an equal basis, mutually beneficial cooperation. This enabled China to lay the foundations for modern industries during a short time and establish a number of basic industrial enterprises it had never had. The Changchun automobile plant, the Loyang tractor plant, high furnaces of the Anshan, the Wuhan, and the Baotou iron and steel plants, and the magnificent Wuhan bridge marked the milestones in the history of Soviet-Chinese cooperation in the fifties.

Under Soviet assistance, China set up not only automobile and tractor manufacturing industries, but also petrochemical, heavy machine-building, aircraft, atomic energy, and defense industries. These were China's new industries built with Soviet technical and economic assistance. Under Soviet assistance, China built some 250 large industrial enterprises and other projects for the national economy. In fact, the Soviet Union provided China, free of charge, with 24,000 sets of scientific and technological information, including blueprints for 1,400 large enterprises. Large numbers of China's skilled workers were trained with Soviet experts' assistance at construction sites in China and at enterprises and schools in the Soviet Union.

From the late fifties to the early sixties Soviet-Chinese relations began to deteriorate, not through the fault of the Soviet Union. Economic and other cooperation between the two countries gradually diminished. In 1979, the Chinese side announced that it did not wish to renew the Soviet-Chinese treaty of friendship, alliance, and mutual assistance. The starting point of the Soviet policy toward China is always that the Soviet Union clearly realizes that equal and allround cooperation between the two countries coincides with the vital interests of the people of our two countries, the interests of international socialism, and the interests of the anti-imperialist struggle.

In recent years, Soviet-Chinese relations have improved. For example, mutually beneficial contacts have been resumed in economic, cultural, scientific, and other fields, and Soviet-Chinese political consultations have been held on a regular basis. The Soviet people are pleased with the improvement in Soviet-Chinese relations.

## PRAVDA CITES HANOI PAPER'S CRITICISM OF PRC

PM151857 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 16 Feb 86 First Edition p 5

[TASS report: "NHAN DAN Commentary"]

[Text] Hanoi, 15 Feb -- NHDN DAN, the organ of the Vietnam Communist Party Central Committee, has published an editorial commentary entitled "Beijing's Hostile Policy Against the Vietnamese People Is Doomed To Fail." The article points out that the PRC has circulated in the United Nations a "memorandum" which falsely claims that Vietnam is stepping up its armed provocations on the border with China. In this "memorandum" Beijing crudely falsifies the real situation on the Vietnamese-Chinese border, groundlessly accuses Vietnam of pursuing an anti-Chinese state policy, and tries to blame Vietnam for crimes committed by the Chinese side.

The article notes that the Vietnamese side recently put forward a proposal for a cease-fire on the border to mark the celebration of the lunar new year. At a conference of foreign ministers in Vientiane, the three Indochinese countries reaffirmed their sincere desire for a normalization of relations with the PRC. Laos and the PRK welcomed the SRV's efforts to resume the Vietnamese-Chinese talks. However, China has not replied to any of these goodwill gestures.

The Chinese artillery shelling of SRV territory, which did not cease even during the period of new year celebrations, is described in the commentary as a "sop to the U.S. generals arriving in Beijing for talks on military cooperation between the two countries."

NHAN DAN rejects China's accusations concerning the so-called intensification of anti-Chinese propaganda in the SRV and stresses that Vietnam is "showing restraint in this sphere whereas China does not stop raining torrents of slander on the SRV."

In conclusion the commentary reaffirms Vietnam's desire for a normalization of relations with China.

FISHERY TALKS WITH JAPAN SUSPENDED 15 FEBRUARY

LD151738 Moscow TASS in English 1727 GMT 15 Feb 86

[Text] Moscow, February 15 TASS -- On the proposal of the Japanese delegation it has been decided to suspend temporarily the second session of the Soviet-Japanese Commission of Fisheries, which was set up under the inter-governmental agreement of December 7, 1984.

The talks examining the terms for mutual fishing in the 200-mile economic zones of the two countries in 1986, has been continuing since late in December. As a TASS correspondent was told at the USSR Ministry of Fisheries, the stands of the sides have somewhat drawn closer recently, yet, the outstanding differences remain essential.

The Soviet side has put forward a number of new compromise decisions for the speediest attainment of agreements, that would enable the fishermen of two countries to start fish catch. Thus, it has agreed to allow Japanese ships to start fishing in the Soviet economic zones with deep sweeps and tiers at depths of more than 300 metres.

It has been proposed that the fish catch quota within the framework of mutual fishing be increased to reach up to 300 thousand tons, despite the fact that it is more difficult for the Soviet seamen to land such a quota in Japan's zones as a result of various restrictions. Last year, for example, as a result of the tough fishing terms, the Soviet fishermen landed in Japan's zone only 145 thousand tons of fish. Albeit their quotas were set at 600 thousand tons.

The Soviet side has also agreed to some concessions as regards the size of the compensation for additional quota and as regards the volume of catch of some fish species within the framework of the quotas.

The Japanese side has not given a positive answer to these proposals, and agreement has only been reached to resume the session in the USSR. The timing will be agreed upon through diplomatic channels.

DEFECTOR ARRIVES IN JAPAN, SEEKS ASYLUM IN U.S.

OW160923 Tokyo KYODO in English 0917 GMT 16 Feb 86

[Text] Tokyo, Feb 16 KYODO -- A 32-year-old crewman of a Soviet fishing boat arrived in Tokyo Sunday seeking asylum in the United States.

Valerii Vacheslavovich Polyanin was picked up by Japanese fishermen Friday while drifting in a rubber raft in the Sea of Japan coastal waters off Aomori Prefecture, northern Japan. He has expressed his wish to defect to the United States according to Japanese Foreign Ministry authorities. They said Soviet Embassy officials will meet him to confirm if he really wants to go to the United States.

The steersman of the Mys Bubushkina said he jumped off from the Soviet trawler Friday morning when it was traveling in the Tsugaru Strait between Honshu and Hokkaido.

CRITICISM OF 'TEAM SPIRIT' EXERCISES CONTINUES

DPRK Meeting

PM171317 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 14 Feb 86 First Edition p 4

[TASS reports: "Dangerous Maneuvers"]

[Text] Pyongyang, 13 Feb -- An extraordinary enlarged session of the Central Committee of the Democratic Front for the Reunification of the Fatherland which was held here, emphasized that the "Team Spirit-86" American-South Korean military maneuvers have resulted in a further exacerbation of the situation in the Korean peninsula and the suspension of the North-South dialogue.

The session participants adopted an appeal to the U.S. people and an appeal to South Korean political parties, public organizations, and representatives of various circles in which they call on them to take resolute action against the policy of confrontation and the aggressive U.S. actions in South Korea. This new show of strength is not just a blatantly provocative and hostile act in relation to the DPRK, it also furthers the implementation of U.S. expansionist plans in the Far East and throughout Asia.

These documents point out that the DPRK has invariably favored a relaxation of tension. The concrete peaceable proposals put forward by the DPRK Government serve this aim. The appeal to the U.S. people calls on them to further broaden the antiwar and anti-nuclear movement and to join the peace-loving forces' struggle for the withdrawal of U.S. forces and nuclear weapons from South Korea and the establishment of a nuclear-free zone, a zone of peace in the Korean peninsula.

The "Team Spirit-86" American-South Korean maneuvers are causing serious concern and alarm among the peace-loving public of the countries of the Asian and Pacific region, they create a direct threat to the DPRK, and infringe the security interests of the Soviet Union and other countries. This is stated in a statement of the Soviet Committee for Solidarity with Asian and African Countries.

Korean Peace Threatened

OW151129 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1500 GMT 13 Feb 86

[From "Novosti" newscast; Alekseyev commentary]

[Text] The large-scale military exercise by the U.S. and South Korean Armed Forces, "Team Spirit-86", is becoming ever more dangerous in character.

[Alekseyev] Hello comrades. We reported a few months ago that, according to an agreement reached between the DPRK and South Korean governments, people from the North and South could freely cross the border dividing the Korean peninsula because of U.S. aggression some time ago, visit each other, and meet their friends and relatives. Their excited and happy faces are still remembered. At that time, the mutual visits of Korean families divided by war were judged by all, and firstly by the Koreans themselves, as an important step to the peaceful reunification of their country. At that time, the DPRK Government proposed to take a new and no less significant step, not to conduct major military exercises in and around the Korean peninsula.

Alas, the Seoul regime and its staunch protector, the United States, answered this peaceful initiative first with an intensification of military preparations in South Korea, and lately with joint military exercises designated "Team Spirit."

Representatives of military commands, both from the United States and South Korea, hastened to assure us that these maneuvers are defensive, having nothing to do with North-South Korean dialogue. But that does not change the essence of the matter. Pentagon war games now involve a record number, over 200,000 South Korean and U.S. military personnel. Warships of the U.S. 7th Fleet, aircraft, cruise missiles, and other combat equipment have been concentrated in close proximity to the DPRK border. The DPRK was forced to place its Armed Forces in a state of increased combat readiness. The situation has acquired an extremely dangerous character. Does it contribute to the peaceful reunification of Korea which, by the way, the U.S. Administration invariably advocates verbally. It is obvious that it does not. It is evident that it also undermines the foundations of security in the Asia-Pacific region, and creates a threat to universal peace.

## Linked With Plans for Japan

LD141959 Moscow World Service in English 1531 GMT 14 Feb 86

[Text] For several days now South Korea has been the site of a major American-South Korean "Team Spirit-86" exercises. Sponsored by the Pentagon, the maneuvers cover much of the Korean peninsula and adjacent areas. Taking part are more than 200,000 United States and South Korean servicemen, aircraft, naval vessels, nuclear-powered submarines included, and other hardware. Our observer (Sergey Ruslanov) contributed this comment.

Although the exercises' scenario is kept secret it is aimed, as in previous years according to the press, at practising large-scale troops landing operations. The maneuvers involve American Marines airlifted from Okinawa. In other words "Team Spirit-86" is another rehearsal of United States swift punitive actions in the world's hotspots. For the 11th time the Korean peninsula south of the 38th parallel is becoming a huge area for big joint maneuvers in the Pacific. What's indicative is that if the first "Team Spirit" series involved about 45,000 servicemen, today's figure is nearly five times over. This indicates that the Pentagon regards the region as exceedingly important in its global strategy and its means not only South Korea, where some 300 United States military facilities with 1,000 nuclear warheads are located.

Washington sets aside a similar role to play for Japan, it's yet another close ally in the region. It's an open secret that the Pentagon plans a new military alliance in the Pacific of Washington, Seoul and Tokyo. The United States has been pursuing this objective consistently and by plan. As a rule the Pentagon has been inviting for "Team Spirit" maneuvers not only its permanently stationed forces on South Korea and the United States west coast, but also troops from bases in Japan. Representatives of Japan's national defense department have been attending the exercises as observers in recent times. Thus Tokyo has been getting increasingly associated with United States plans to set up a military alliance of the three countries. More than that, Japan has agreed that its air force would join American troops in an exercise near the Korean peninsula. Under Washington's massive pressure agreement was reached in principle between Tokyo and Seoul to exchange visits by naval vessels. Japan has pledged to provide Seoul with economic and military aid, and this commitment is being implemented. According to official statistics the Japanese taxpayers annually cash 4 million yen, or up to $20,000 to maintain each of the 40,000 American soldiers in South Korea.

As a result the United States has gradually been vigorously pushing its Far Eastern allies to forming a Far Eastern alliance similar to NATO. Why the United States needs a military bloc in the Pacific is common knowledge. Its main goal is to threaten the national liberation movements in the Pacific and Asia, dictate its terms to sovereign nations and achieve military superiority in this strategically important region. Such irresponsible steps undermine the difficult process of reunifying Korea peacefully.

The consequences of all this for both the members of the alliance and other nations in the region are clear. This can only lead to a further arms race and great attention and ultimately a greater risk of a serious military conflict, and that is why the peace forces and all nations of Asia are resolutely opposed to the aggressive policy of the United States, and demand that the Asian Pacific region be made a zone of peace and security. Many initiatives of the socialist nations in Asia, and among them the Soviet proposals for a comprehensive approach to security in the region, were advanced with that goal in mind.

## DPRK Embassy Briefing

LD101530 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1500 GMT 10 Feb 86

[Text] A news conference for USSR and foreign journalists was held at the DPRK Embassy in Moscow today in connection with the decision by the Washington administration and the South Korean authorities to hold joint military maneuvers on the territory of South Korea on 10 February. Major General Kim Hak-san, the military, naval, and air force attache at the DPRK Embassy in the USSR who spoke at the news conference, spoke highly of the recent TASS statement in which the USSR resolutely condemned the actions of Washington and Seoul and called for support for the DPRK's proposal on turning the Korean peninsula into a peace zone.

## ECONOMIC COOPERATION WITH DPRK EXAMINED

SK140930 Moscow International Service in Korean 1130 GMT 13 Feb 86

[Talk by (Yuriy Serinikov), "responsible functionary" of the Soviet State Committee for Foreign Economic Relations]

[Text] As you listeners well know, the level of economic ties maintained between our two countries was appraised in an affirmative manner in the recent talks held between Comrade Kang Song-san, member of the WPK Central Committee Political Bureau and premier of the DPRK Administration Council, and Comrade Mikhail Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee. At the same time, the need to further expand these ties was noted in these talks.

I would like to recall that a protocol for developing trade and economic cooperation between the Soviet Union and Korea from 1986 to 1990 was signed in Moscow at the end of December last year. This protocol envisages a remarkable increase in the total exchange of goods during the present 5-year plan period and the further expansion of economic ties between the Soviet Union and the DPRK. In other words, economic cooperation between the Soviet Union and Korea will reach a new summit. This cooperation will be more than doubled in 5 years. Soviet economic and technical aid for the development of the important sectors of the people's economy of the DPRK, including the ferrous and nonferrous metal, machine manufacturing, energy -- including atomic energy -- and coal industrial sectors, will be the basic content of this cooperation.

Let us cite several examples of this. Our country has continuously aided fraternal Korea in the direction of further expanding the Kim Chaek steel mill. The production capacity of this steel mill will reach the level of 2,300,000 tons of steel annually. In other words, the production capacity of this steel mill will increase by 1.4 times. The steel mill has been equipped with a new electronic furnace and with a continuous steel casting system, and other production capacities have increased at this steel mill. The delivery of major parts of necessary equipment has already been completed. A group of our engineers and technicians has left for the DPRK to assemble and operate this equipment.

Two enterprises that will occupy an important position in the people's economic sector in the Republic will be inaugurated this year. This will be of great significance in developing other industrial sectors in the country. These enterprises include an aluminium and a bearing plant. If these plants are inaugurated, the DPRK will be able to completely meet its own demand for the goods needed. For example, the Yongsong bearing plant will annually produce 10 million bearings of various kinds and sizes. Some of these goods will be delivered to the Soviet Union in accordance with the principle of the distribution of products.

Cooperation between our two countries has been effectively realized in the energy sector. It is expected that the Chongjin thermal power plant will be inaugurated in the first half of 1986 after completing assembling work as the fourth thermal power plant built in people's Korea with Soviet aid. Soviet leaders are now preparing blueprints for the construction of a new east Pyongyang thermal power plant capable of producing 200,000 milowatts of electricity and of the first nuclear power plant in the DPRK.

Soviet-Korean cooperation has been realized successfully in the coal industrial sector -- in increasing the annual production of coal by 5 million tons at the Anju colliery. In accordance with blueprints prepared by Soviet technicians, two new collieries and ore dressing plants are being built. The work of equipping these enterprises with high-speed excavators, loaders, coal-mining combines, and conveyor belt systems is in the stage of completion.

The Soviet Union is aiding people's Korea is launching the comprehensive survey work for tapping oil deposits on the DPRK continental shelf through the use of the method of [words indistinct]. A group of Soviet technicians staying in fraternal Korea is now carrying out such work with Korean fellow workers.

Trade between our two countries has successfully developed this year. The Soviet Union is exporting industrial raw materials and some goods, including oil, goods made of crude oil, coke, coking coal, mingane and chrome ores, alloy, and aluminium; and various machines and equipment to the DPRK. The DPRK is exporting magnesia clinker, cement, carbide, some of people's consumer goods, and agricultural raw materials to the Soviet Union.

These are some examples of the economic cooperation between the Soviet Union and Korea. Undoubtedly this cooperation will expand and develop to increase the welfare of the peoples of our two countries.

## RUSAKOV RECEIVES MONGOLIAN AMBASSADOR

LD150031 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1800 GMT 14 Feb 86

[From the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] Comrade Rusakov today received Gurbadam, ambassador of the Mongolian People's Republic to the Soviet Union, at the latter's request. They held a conversation that took place in a warm and friendly atmosphere.

## ZIA TURNS FACTS 'UPSIDE DOWN' IN REMARKS ON DRA

LD141837 Moscow TASS in English 1806 GMT 14 Feb 86

[Text] Moscow, February 14 TASS -- TASS news analyst Valeriy Maksimov writes:

President Ziaul Haq, speaking in Karachi at the Institute of Domestic Problems, has asserted that Pakistan is striving for a political settlement in Afghanistan. He said that the Soviet Union is responsible for the situation that developed in Afghanistan. He even tried to convince the audience that Islamabad does not give assistance to counter-revolutionary Afghan forces. These are words, and how does Islamabad's striving for a political settlement look in deed?

The initiatives of the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan aimed at normalizing the situation in the interests of all peoples of the region are broadly known. Babrak Karmal has repeatedly stated that "The Democratic Republic of Afghanistan stands for any negotiations with Pakistan, at any level at which goodwill will be demonstrated towards solution of contradictions." He (?repeatedly) expressed readiness "to discuss and settle all details, all disputable questions in direct negotiations." And Islamabad's answer was ever the same -- no direct negotiations with the Babrak Karmal government.

It was also repeatedly [words indistinct] presence of a limited contingent of Soviet troops in the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan is temporary. This is a forced action which was taken in reply to the armed intervention and other forms of interference from outside, specifically from Pakistan. When this interference ceases and firm international guarantees are given, the Soviet military contingent will return home.

As to Ziaul Haq's statement that Islamabad does not render assistance to counter-revolutionaries in their criminal actions against the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan, this statement is contrary to the generally known facts. (?Exactly from) Pakistan's territory there are more than 120 centers for training counterrevolutionary gangs. Counterrevolutionaries are trained not only by American but also by Pakistani specialists. Moreover, (?Pakistani) instructors even take part in these bandit groups' inroads into Afghanistan.

And are the sweeping punitive actions of Pakistani troops against Pashtun tribes not assistance to counterrevolutionaries? Killing Pashtuns, wrecking their homes, Islamabad "clears" routes for gangs of mercenaries to make their way into the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan, creates conditions for them to prepare for new criminal acts. It is clear that by his assertions Ziaul Haq turned facts upside-down.

## AFGHANISTAN LODGES UN PROTEST AGAINST PAKISTAN

LD152029 Moscow TASS in English 2005 GMT 15 Feb 86

[Text] New York, February 15 TASS -- The DRA Government has attracted the attention of the international community to Pakistan's and Iran's crude interference into the home affairs of Afghanistan.

As is pointed out in a letter from Mohammad Farid Zarif, DRA's permanent representative to the U.N., addressed to the U.N. secretary general, Pakistan's new hostile act was committed on February 5, when a Pakistani airforce jet plane invaded Afghanistan's air space.

The DRA Government condemns the provocative and irresponsible actions of the Pakistani armed forces, which are conducive to a deterioration of the situation in the region, and demands an immediate end to them, says the letter issued as an official document of the U.N. General Assembly and Security Council.

Afghanistan's Government has also informed in its letter to U.N. Secretary General Javier Perez de Cuellar about the subversive actions of the so-called "United Islamic Front" in Afghanistan, which was established with the participation of Iranian religious figures, Afghans resident in Iran and representatives of counter-revolutionary gangs. This activity boils down to instigation of the population to perpetrating acts of terrorism, and is nothing else but an open aggression against Afghanistan, says the letter. The DRA Government resolutely demands that the Iranian authorities take measures in order to put an end to all forms of aggression, interference and provocations against the Afghan people.

## IRAN WARNED AGAINST SUPPORTING AFGHAN REBELS

NC151652 Moscow in Persian to Iran 1100 GMT 15 Feb 86

[Igor Sheftunov commentary]

[Excerpts] Iranian officials organized a meeting at Tehran's Laleh Hotel last week involving a group of Afghan counterrevolutionaries, a number of domestic correspondents, and some so-called foreign Muslim activists. Those who took part slandered neighboring Democratic Afghanistan and made several accusations against it.

The people of this republic carried out a democratic and anti-feudal revolution 8 years ago. They have launched progressive reforms and are building a new life. As you know, in the course of land and water reform, property belonging to Afghan feudal lords who had fled to Iran and Pakistan was confiscated and turned over to hundreds of thousands of rural families free of charge.

None of this pleased those reactionary Afghans who are trying to bring feudal lords and usurers back to power in Afghanistan and to get a 31-billion afghani loan repaid. The April Revolution saved some 11 million Afghan workers from this loan.

Acting under various Islamic titles, Afghan reactionaries have created piratical organizations such as the Harakat-e Eslami-ye Afghanistan, Hezb-e Eslami-ye Afghanistan, and others. The imperialist governments, primarily, the United States, as well as regional reactionaries have been using Afghan counterrevolutionaries in their undeclared war against Democratic Afghanistan for the past 8 years. Representatives of these brigands declared in their speeches at the Laleh Hotel that they would continue the war against Afghanistan.

Special camps have been set up in Mashhad, Zahedan, Tehran, Torbat-e Heydariyeh, and other Iranian cities for Afghans lured into Iran. Counterrevolutionaries go to these camps to organize subversive groups armed with weapons sent from the United States and other imperialist countries. CIA employees help to train these bands. This year Washington will send $470 million in arms to the Afghan counterrevolutionaries. These bands, which are sent into Afghanistan from Pakistan and Iran, do great damage and harm to Afghan civilians.

According to partial data, the brigands have destroyed about 2,000 schools, 300 mosques, and more than 150 hospitals and clinics. They have killed hundreds of teachers and clergymen and have destroyed more than 900 agricultural cooperatives.

However, the imperialists and reactionaries cannot derail the Afghan revolution and destroy the historic gains of the Afghan people, who bravely stand up to foreign aggression. On the basis of a treaty of friendship signed between our two countries, the Soviet Union helps the Afghans in this struggle. Progressive forces throughout the world, namely Islamic countries such as Syria, the PDRY and Libya, are on the side of the Afghans.

Iranian officials and Afghan counterrevolutionaries who have found refuge in Iran will find it more and more difficult each year to use the afghans who have been lured into Iran as a weapon for aggression against Democratic Afghanistan. Thousands of Afghans went on a hunger strike in a Mashhad camp and announced that they would not cease their protest until they could go home. Iranian officials are trying to suppress the Afghans' protests by force. Revolutionary Guards, who play the role of jailers, recently raided a camp, killing three and wounding eight. Moreover, a large number of Afghans who want to return to their homeland are in Zahedan's central prison. Some of them were taken by force to Iran's deserts where they died of hunger and thirst.

The Iranian officials' intervention in Afghanistan's domestic affairs is becoming more and more blatant and overt. The Iranian press reported recently that a group of Iranian religious leaders and Afghan counterrevolutionaries entered Afghan territory illegally on the orders of Iran's high-ranking clergymen to set up a so-called United Islamic Front. The Afghan Government officially protested to Iranian officials and called on the Iranian leadership to stop intervention and acts of aggression and provocation against Afghanistan. The Iranian representative in Kabul was told that if these hostile acts do not end, the government of Democratic Afghanistan will have to take decisive steps to stop them.

The times require that immediate steps be taken in response to the unmistakable warning by neighboring, peace-loving, and Democratic Afghanistan.

## DRA PEACE SOCIETY SUPPORTS SOVIET ARMS PROPOSALS

LD141336Moscow TASS in English 1149 GMT 14 Feb 86

[Text] Kabul, February 14 TASS -- The January 15 statement by the General Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee Mikhail Gorbachev has once again clearly confirmed the immutability of the Soviet Union's position in respect of questions of strengthening peace in the whole world, stopping the arms race and the planet's militarisation and the total liquidation of all types of nuclear arms, it is said in the statement of the Organisation of Peace, Solidarity and Friendship of the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan.

In the international arena the Soviet Union invariably pursues a policy of the peaceful coexistence of states with differenc social systems, a policy of equal economic relations, of equal security for all, a policy directed at creating a peaceful and healthy atmosphere in inter-state relations, it is stressed in the statement. This was confirmed once again by the USSR's decision to unilaterally impose a moratorium on all nuclear explosions till December 31, 1985 that was then extended to another three months. But the United States is yet to respond positively to this step taken by the Soviet Union, it is noted in the statement of the Organisation of Peace, Solidarity and Friendship of the DRA.

The situation in the Asian continent remains troubled, it is said in the statement by the Organisation of Peace, Solidarity, and Friendship of the DRA. The danger of war comes from reactionary regimes, including the one in Pakistan, that are supported by American imperialism. The possible arming of the Pakistani Army with nuclear arms is especially alarming. For this reason the Organisation of Peace, Solidarity and Friendship together with other peaceable and progressive organisations in the world voices its support of the Soviet proposals to fully liquidate all stockpiles of nuclear and chemical weapons in the world by the end of this century, including of course, in Asia.

On behalf of the entire Afghan people the DRA Organisation of Peace, Solidarity and Friendship urges the United States to accept the Soviet peace proposals and thereby contribute to the cause of ridding mankind of the danger of nuclear war and of ensuring universal peace and security.

## TRADE AGREEMENT FOR 1986-1990 SIGNED WITH DRA

PM171519 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 14 Feb 86 First Edition p 4

[TASS report: "Developing Cooperation"]

[Text] On 13 February talks between government delegations of the USSR and the DRA ended in Moscow. An agreement on trade turnover in 1986-1990 and other documents regulating trade relations between the two countries during this period were signed.

The past 5-year period has been marked by a substantial increase in Soviet-Afghan trade, whose volume has tripled.

The documents that were signed create favorable prospects for the further development of Soviet-Afghan trade relations, which are based on the principle of equality and mutual advantage. Trade turnover between the USSR and the DRA is to increase by approximately 30 percent in 1986-1990.

The talks were held in an atmosphere of businesslike cooperation and comradely mutual understanding.

The documents were signed by B.I. Aristov, USSR minister of foreign trade, and M.Kh. Jalalar, DRA minister of commerce.

The signing ceremony was attended by H. Mangal, DRA ambassador to the Soviet Union.

## INDIAN TV CANCELS U.S. FILM ON INDIRA GANDHI

LD172346 Moscow TASS in English 2256 GMT 17 Feb 86

[Text] New Delhi, February 17 TASS -- TASS correspondent L. Kotov reports:

Indian television has cancelled the show of the documentary "The India of Rajiv" made to a script by U.S. journalist Jack Anderson. The newspaper NATIONAL HERALD close to government circles stresses that the film-makers included in it the sequences which cannot be interpreted otherwise than an attempt to hurt the national feelings of Indian people. Particular indignation here has been aroused by attacks on Indira Gandhi, the glorious daughter of the Indian people, former prime minister of India.

In an affront to her memory, U.S. movie dealers resorted to an overt juggling with facts, protraying in a tendentious light Indira Gandhi's policy of strengthening the sovereignty and security of the country.

"Anderson's film has become a typical example of poisonous propaganda which is unceasingly conducted in the West against our country", points out a message sent by Beli Ram Bhagat, Indian minister of external affairs, by Yashpal Kapoor, a prominent figure of the ruling INC (I) Party. The rabid campaign launched in the United States against the outstanding leader of India is indicative of the hostility which the ruling circles of the West entertain towards the Indian People and towards the republic's socio-economic accomplishments, he emphasises.

The way to Indian screens for Anderson's film has been barred in time. However, the country's public points out with concern that the film was widely shown on American television.

The local press stresses that films shown on Western screens quite often contain grossly distorted information on the state of affairs in the newly-independent states of Asia, Africa and Latin America and pass over in silence the just struggle of their peoples for full political and economic emancipation.

## BRIEFS

LITERATURE EXCHANGE WITH INDIA -- New Delhi February 13 TASS -- The State Committee of the USSR for Book Publishing and the Department for Education at the Indian Ministry for the Development of Human Resources have signed a protocol here, which provides for a 20-volume collection of best works by Soviet writers to be issued in this country and a similar series of works by modern Indian authors to be put out in the Soviet Union in the current decade. The protocol also provides for studying the issue of publishing series of children's books in the USSR and India and translating their classics into languages of the peoples of the two countries as well as for holding book fairs and literary symposiums and seminars. [Text] [Moscow TASS in English 1852 GMT 13 Feb 86 ID]

PEACE COMMITTEE DELEGATION IN NEPAL -- Katmandu, 10 Feb (TASS) -- A visit to Nepal by a delegation of the Soviet Committee for the Defense of Peace led by deputy of the USSR Supreme Soviet I.N. Klychev, at the invitation of the all-Nepal Peace Committee has been completed. A joint document on the results of the visit was signed, in which support was expressed for the new peaceful Soviet initiatives contained in the statement of M.S. Gorbachev, CPSU Central Committee general secretary. The sides stated their solidarity with the fighting people of Afghanstan in the cause of defending the gains of the April Revolution, and decisively condemned the underhanded plotting of imperialism in the Near East and in Central America and also the apartheid regiem in the RSA. The representatives of the Soviet Committee for the Defense of Peace and the all-Nepal Peace Committee spoke out in favor of the further expansion of bilateral links. [Text] [Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1302 GMT 10 Feb 86 LD]

TASS STATEMENT REJECTS U.S. ACTIONS IN PACIFIC

LD141645 Moscow TASS in English 1640 GMT 14 Feb 86

["Micronesia -- TASS statement" -- TASS identifier]

[Text] Moscow, February 14 TASS -- The U.S. President recently signed a bill, earlier adopted by the American Congress, approving an agreement on "free association" between the United States of America and the Marshall Islands and the Federated States of Micronesia in the Pacific. A similar agreement was imposed several years ago on the Mariana Islands. They in Washington hope that the same lot will soon befall the Palau Islands -- the last of the four vast insular territories known under the common name of Micronesia.

Thus, the process of the forced transformation by the United States of the islands actually into its neo-colonial possessions, protracted for four decades, is coming to an end. Washington is doing that at will, through domestic legislative acts, in evident violation of international law.

As is known, the United States received a temporary mandate to administer Micronesia as a U.N. trust territory from the U.N. Security Council in 1947. Instead of undertaking the efforts "to promote the political, economic, social, and educational advancement of the inhabitants of the trust territories, and their progressive development towards self-government or independence," as the Charter of the United Nations says, the United States has done everything to deny the Micronesian people independence, sovereignty and the possibility of self-determination.

Micronesia has been divided into separate parts in order to complicate united actions by the native population of the islands for their rights. The United States not only failed to promote the establishment of a viable economy on the islands. As a result, Micronesia's self-sufficiency is currently far lower than during the initial period of the trusteeship.

Disregarding its commitments, flouting the rights of the native population of the islands, the U.S.A. has over the past years been painstakingly turning the United Nations trust territory into a military place d'armes assigned the role of a rather important link in the chain of strategic military bases and strongholds of the Pentagon in the western part of the Pacific Ocean. It will not be superfluous to recall that U.S. planes that dropped atomic bombs on Hiroshima and Nagasaki took off the territory of Micronesia. Starting from 1946 the U.S. A. used the islands of Micronesia for testing nuclear weapons. At present Kwajalein Atoll is used by the Pentagon for intercontinental ballistic missile tests.

Thrusting on Micronesia the so-called "agreements on free association", the United States pursues the obvious aim -- to lay its hands on that Pacific territory and deprive Micronesians of independence for good. Under these "agreements" the U.S.A. appropriates an exclusive right of control over questions of external relations, defense, and finance of Micronesian territories. The Pentagon intends in the future, too, to retain and enlarge the proving grounds for rocketry testing, naval bases, airfields for strategic aviation and other military facilities established in the islands, to station nuclear, chemical and other types of mass annihilation weapons there. The transformation of that region into a strategic military place d'armes of the U.S.A. constitutes a serious threat not only to the people of Micronesia, but to the peoples of other countries in the Asian-Pacific region.

It is a fact that unilateral actions of the U.S.A. constitute an open challenge to the principles and provisions of the Charter of the United Nations and the declaration on the granting of independence to colonial countries and peoples.

Its decision concerning the destiny of the Marshall Islands, the Federated States of Micronesia, and in the near future -- concerning the future of Palau, the American side is trying to push through the United Nations without the decision being endorsed by the Security Council. Meanwhile, the United Nations retains its responsibility for the destiny of Micronesia until that territory has exercised genuine self-determination. As it is clearly recorded in Article 83 of the Charter of the United Nations, any change in the status of a strategic trust area, which the Pacific Islands are under agreement between the Security Council and the United States of America, shall be made only by a decision of the Security council and, consequently, cannot be effected by the administering power.

The destiny of the people of Micronesia is a component part of the problem of decolonization, and it is the duty of the United Nations, all member-states of that organization to preclude an attempt to put the world before an accomplished fact of absorption of that territory by the United states. Moreover, one cannot fail to see that the annexationist plans with respect to Micronesia come as one of the manifestations of the imperial ambitions of the U.S.A., realization of the policy of "new globalism" in practice. If barriers are not put up today on the way toward a seizure of the Pacific islands, other countires and territories will become an oject of American expansion tomorrow.

The question about a trust territory, if the Charter of the United Nations is to be followed, should be solved in the Security Council. The United Nations organization should ensure the exercise by the people of Micronesia of the natural right to the establishment of a united independent state. A fitting rebuff should be given to the neocolonialist actions of the United States and to its arbitrariness with respect to a small people of the Pacific islands.

## PHILIPPINE ASSEMBLY DECLARES MARCOS VICTOR

PM171615 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 16 Feb 86 First Edition p 5

[TASS report: "Winner Announced"]

[Text] Manila, 15 Feb -- The Philippine National Assembly (parliament) today declared Ferdinand Marcos the winner of the 7 February presidential elections. According to the official results 1,515,000 more voters voted for him than for Corazon Aquino, the opposition's main presidential hopeful. A candidate from the ruling New Society Movement (KBL) coalition -- Arturo Tolentino -- was also elected vice president.

The results of the voting have been totaled up for all the country's 140 cities and provinces. KBL candidates were successful in 8 of the country's 13 economic and administrative regions. The fourfold voting advantage gained by F. Marcos and A. Tolentino in the provinces of northern Luzon Island -- traditionally considered the ruling coalition's stronghold -- compensated for their losses in a number of other regions, including the greater Manila region with a population of over 8 million.

The opposition headed by C. Aquino refused to recognize the official election results and announced its intention to hold mass protest demonstrations in the country tomorrow and start a nationwide "civil disobediance" campaign. The Catholic Church in the Philippines sided with the opposition.

They see the visit by the Washington emissary as falling within the framework of the U.S. Administration's incessant attempts to exploit the current unstable situation in the country in order to strengthen and expand its military-strategic position and its political and economic influence on the Philippines.

## Cabinet Resigns

LD161856 Moscow TASS in English 1742 GMT 16 Feb 86

[Text] Manila, February 16 TASS -- President Ferdinand Marcos of the Philippines addressed here today a press conference on the results of the presidential elections held on February 7. He said that he is a lawfully elected president and will act in accordance with the constitution. The president said that the whole cabinet resigned and also announced the resignation of General Fabian Ver as chief of staff of the Armed Forces of the Philippines. Lieutenant-General Fidel Ramos will take over as acting chief of staff. He said that "important measures" in the economic field would be announced within the next few days. The head of state urged the population to observe calm and refrain from unrest.

Meanwhile Corazon Aquino, who was opposition candidate in the presidential elections, addressed a rally in Manila, urging her supporters to hold one-day protest strike on February 26, the next day after Marcos will be officially inaugurated president for the new term.

Philip Habib, U.S. special presidential envoy, who was sent to Manila on a "fact finding mission" after the elections, has started consultations. Tomorrow he is to meet with Marcos.

Increasing U.S. interference in the internal affairs of the Philippines arouses mounting public indignation. An anti-American demonstration has been held outside the U.S. Embassy today.

## HUSAK, ZHIVKOV PRAISES GORBACHEV ARMS PROPOSALS

### Husak Statement

LD162204 Moscow TASS in English 2149 GMT 16 Feb 86

[Text] Prague, February 16 TASS - Prevention of a nuclear catastrophe, a peaceful resolution of all international issues are the dictates of the times, said Gustav Husak, general secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia, addressing the report and election party conference of the Prague party city organisation of the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia.

In a number of areas of the world, the Czechoslovak leader continued, seats of military conflicts are smoldering. Mountains of mass destruction weapons have been accumulated in the world threatening to destroy human civilisation. That is precisely why, demonstrating a sense of responsibility for the planet's future, the Soviet Union has put forward a large-scale programme whose aim is to reduce and then totally eliminate nuclear weapons by the year of 2000. Yet, some circles in the USA are trying to use all sorts of pretexts to call these realistic proposals in question and evade giving a concrete answer to them.

They continue striving for universal domination, while the U.S. military-industrial complex is reluctant to give up the enormous profits from the arms race.

The Czechoslovak people is profoundly aware how deeply the questions of peace and war concern its vital interests. Therefore, it completly supports the Soviet peace initiatives. The tragic experience of our history and the price which has been paid for the country's freedom and independence are a reminder that it is only in alliance with the USSR and all countries of the socialist community that it is possible to ensure the peaceful development of Czechoslovakia, Gustav Husak said.

It can be said with gratification that the USSR's peaceful proposals meet with growing international support. There is growing conviction in the world of the need to resolve the international security issues on the basis of the principles proposed by the Soviet Union. This is a source of hope that it will be possible to divert the nuclear threat and ensure a peaceful future for mankind, Gustav Husak said in conclusion.

### Zhivkov Statement

LD141521 Moscow TASS in English 1504 GMT 14 Feb 86

[Text] Sofia, February 14 TASS -- The real way to preventing the danger of a world nuclear conflagration is shown by the Soviet Union's programme for the total elimination up to the year 2000 of nuclear weapons and prohibition of space strike weapons, Todor Zhivkov, general secretary of the Central Committee of the Bulgarian Communist Party, said here.

The Bulgarian leader stressed that together with the fraternal countries of the socialist community, the People's Republic of Bulgaria is making its contribution to the struggle for putting an end to the arms race, for preventing its spreading into outer space, for general disarmament. In that connection he pointed out the need for turning the Balkans into a zone free from nuclear and chemical weapons, which is favoured by the People's Republic of Bulgaria.

## UNITY OF PORTUGUESE LEFT LED TO ELECTION VICTORY

PM171831 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 18 Feb 86 First Edition p 5

[Valeriy Volkov "Commentator's Column": "Right-Wing Forces Rebuffed"]

[Text] Lisbon -- The second round of the presidential election has taken place in Portugal. It ended in victory for Mario Soares, former leader of the Socialist Party, who, according to preliminary figures, received 51 percent of the votes. For the first time in the last 60 years a civilian, rather than military politician has become the country's president.

The result of the voting, local commentators note, is not so much a victory for one candidate over the others. It is more a defeat for the right-wing forces grouped around D. Freitas do Amaral. "Reaction," the paper O DIARIO writes in a commentary, "has suffered its most crushing defeat since the victory of the 1974 April revolution." The paper notes that it is also a blow to the policy of the current Social Democratic government which "openly backed Freitas do Amaral and participated in the election campaign on his side."

The democratically minded strata of the populace, including people who traditionally vote for the Socialists and Communists, gave M. Soares victory at the election. As a result of the unity achieved in the struggle for the revolutionary gains of 25 April, and the political realism displayed by the majority of the population, the democratic forces' main task at the present stage -- the defeat of the rightists' stooge -- was carried out. Local political observers hope that this has halted the trend toward the right which has lately been characteristic of events in Portugal.

The local press notes that the election of M. Soares was due largely to the stance adopted by the Portuguese Communists during the election. He received maximum support in those areas where the Communist Party and its allies are traditionally strong. Without having any illusions about M. Soares' views and his policy of compromise with the conservatives, the Communists urged support for his candidacy in the second round of the election in order to block the candidate of the right-wing circles: The results of the voting show that the stance of the Portuguese Communist Party, its organization, and the democrats' unity of action played a decisive part in the outcome of the presidential election and in the defeat of reaction's plans.

The outcome of the election in Portugal shows that left-wing forces have some large and complex tasks to carry out in the immediate future. The Portuguese people's success in upholding the democratic gains of the 1974 April revolution will depend largely on the left-wing forces' unity.

## SPAIN'S DILEMMA OVER NATO MEMBERSHIP VIEWED

LD180016 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1934 GMT 17 Feb 86

[From "The World Today" program presented by Igor Kudrin]

[Excerpts] On 25 February, the official campaign in connection with the forthcoming nationwide referendum begins in Spain. The referendum itself is to be held on 12 March and concerns one of the most acute problems: Should the country be in the North Atlantic Alliance or not? This question naturally is a cause of concern to millions of Spaniards. The attitude to NATO has split Spain into two opposing camps: the supporters of the country's secession from the aggressive bloc and those wishing that it stay in NATO's ranks.

You may ask me, comrades, what is the correlation of forces between these two camps and who will be the winner in the forthcoming poll! Until recently, I, and, incidentally, not I alone, without thinking would have replied simply -- the Atlanticists are in the minority: They will lose to the forces opposing the country's staying within NATO who come out for a neutral Spain. This was confirmed by the results of numerous polls. Now, one must approach a reply to this question with greater caution. The likelihood of giving an accurate forecast has significantly lessened. What then is the matter, what has happened, and what has changed?

The position of the leading political force -- the Spanish Socialist Workers' Party which is in power, has changed. I was working in Madrid in 1982 at the height of the election campaign. At that time the Socialists were waging the struggle for places in Parliament, through loud slogans which attracted millions of citizens. If in the sphere of domestic policy, this was the promise to create 800,000 new jobs, in foreign policy it was an unconditional anti-NATO policy. In case of victory, the Socialists promised to quickly convene a plebiscite on the country's membership of the North Atlantic Alliance.

Only 3 and 1/2 years have passed and the party's position has changed most fundamentally. Now the Socialists are urgently calling on their supporters to say yes to staying in NATO, in the name of Spain's interests, as the party's official slogan now says. And naturally many Spaniards have begun to waver and doubt. They have also changed their convictions because they believe in the head of the leading party or because of party discipline, or else they must do not want to create an acute political situation in the country.

Felipe Gonzalez and members of his cabinet now refer to the changed situation. Now Spain has been accepted into the Common Market and henceforth must in all aspects adhere to the Western orientation and Western discipline. The fact that NATO guarantees the country's security and is assisting the modernization of the national armed forces is also mentioned. Other arguments are also set forth. The struggle between the two camps is nevertheless getting hotter. That is why it is not easy to predict the results of the referendum. Advocates of Spain's secession from the North Atlantic bloc -- including the Communists, members of the leading trade union confederation and working commissions -- do not cease their struggle even for a moment. It is not easy for them, as the state television and press clearly inclines to the government's point of view. Politicians both from Washington and from West European capitals are joining in the campaign, in the capacity of neutral observers.

Everyone can imagine what confusion would be caused in NATO's ranks by the decision of of the majority of the Spanish people to leave the aggressive bloc. NATO leaders are afraid even to think what kind of example may be given by the Spanish people to other peoples of Western Europe. Thus only 12 March itself will give a reply to the question concerning millions of Spanish people -- whether their motherland is or is not to be in NATO.

## BONN PRESSURED TO ACCEPT NEW CHEMICAL WEAPONS

LD082213 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1745 GMT 8 Feb 86

[From the "International Diary" program presented by Georgiy Alekseyev with correspondent Viktor Glazunov from Bonn]

[Text] As is well known, the Soviet disarmament program takes account of such a mass destruction weapon as chemical weapons. The task is being set to eliminate them in this century, and this aspect most immediately relates to the European continent.

The stockpiles of chemical means of waging war are enormous there, and to judge by the Pentagon's plans, will be supplemented, and moreover, primarily with the latest chemical weapons, including binary missiles. We have Bonn on the line now; I turn to our correspondent Victor Glazunov. It is thought the U.S. military's plans have generated a most acute situation within the FRG. Is that not so?

[Glazunov] Yes, that's correct. The chemical weapons issue directly relates to the FRG. The FRG took on an obligation in the fifties not to produce and not to have atomic, chemical, or bacteriological weapons. The paradox of the situation, however, is that the FRG is the country with the largest concentration of both atomic and chemical weapons in NATO. It is true they are U.S. weapons, but they are on the territory of the FRG with the knowledge and consent of that country's government. The FRG is a key country within the Pentagon's military strategic conception, which envisages inflicting thrusts into the full depth of the enemy's defensive formations with a whole complex of nuclear, chemical, and conventional weapons.

Experts believe that the whole of central Europe will be turned into a dead region in the event the chemical weapons stockpiled in the FRG are used. And now there is the question of binary weapons, and again the Americans are faced with the question of where to put them. Naturally the Pentagon has a scenario for both atomic and chemical war in Europe. Here the eyes of those in the Pentagon are again turned towards the FRG. They are, it is true, currently giving assurances, both over the ocean and on the Rhine, that the United States has no intention for the moment of siting binary missiles outside the United States. For the moment. And in this regard the following is curious and very significant: The Social Democrats have put a draft resolution before the Bundestag on preventing the siting of binary weapons on FRG territory. This draft was rejected by the government parties. Why, one asks? Because it already has been decided in the Pentagon where and when binary missiles should be put -- in the FRG, as close as possible to the defensive formations of the Warsaw Pact countries, as it is customary to say in the Pentagon's language. And in Bonn, they agree with this by all accounts. If not, then why decline proposals for preventing the siting of binary weapons on FRG territory?

[Alekseyev] Viktor Mikhailovich, as is well known, the GDR and Czechoslovak Governments recently proposed to the FRG Government that they begin talks on the creation of a chemical weapons-free zone in the center of Europe. What was Bonn officialdom's attitude to this?

[Glazunov] Well, Bonn officialdom took a negative attitude to this, on the pretext that they prefer a global settlement. Naturally a global settlement is good, but they in Bonn know where the key to a global settlement lies; namely, in Washington. It is Washington which has been sabotaging the conclusion of a convention on a total ban and elimination of chemical weapons for many years. Such an interim regional measure as the creation of a chemical-free zone in central Europe will be useful in these conditions. It will be simpler to implement it. This also will create favorable conditions for a global solution to the problem, and will remove the risk of chemical war in Europe. Bonn is clearly hiding behind the back of Washington. Clearly the Social Democrats, who speak of Bonn's vassal dependence on Washington, which does not allow Bonn to take a single independent step even if such a step is in the FRG's national interests, are correct.

SPD, SED DISCUSS NUCLEAR ISSUES IN BONN

LD161518 Moscow TASS in English 1216 GMT 16 Feb 86

[Text] Bonn, February 16 TASS -- Hermann Axen, member of the Political Bureau of the Central Committee of the Socialist Unity Party of Germany, SUPG, secretary of the Central Committee of the SUPG, and Egon Bahr, member of the Presidium of the Board of the Social Democratic Party of Germany, SPD, spoke highly of the Soviet peace initiatives as a press conference in Bonn on Saturday. The press conference dealt with the results of two-day talks of the SUPG and SDP joint working group on creating in central Europe a zone free from battlefied nuclear weapons.

Due to the Soviet-U.S. summit in Geneva and the Soviet-proposed programme for the elimination of nuclear weapons the group had worked in more favourable conditions this time, Herman Axen stressed. The group thoroughly discussed the plan for the elimination of all types of nuclear weapons by the year 2000 and concluded that it gave a new powerful impulse to the movement for arms limitation and for disarmament.

People of the two German states and people throughout Europe would be relieved of the nightmare looming over then, if nuclear weapons could be eliminated in places of their highest concentration. "I welcome the Soviet initiatives because they for the first time contain the concept of eliminating all types of nuclear weapons, including tactical ones," Egon Bahr said.

The members of the working group stressed it was exceptionaly important that an agreement on a complete ban on nuclear tests be signed as soon as possible and that the treaty on the limitation of anti-ballistic missile systems by strictly observed.

ANTONOV TRIAL ENDING; WESTERN BACKING RECALLED

LD152240 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1530 GMT 15 Feb 86

[Commentary by Yu. Rostov; from the "Vremya" newscast]

[Excerpts] Legal proceedings concerning the case of the assassination attempts on the life of Pope John Paul II are drawing to a close in Rome. The case of Sergei Antonov: this is the way the Western press usually refers to this trial.

The year of 1981: the United States is imposing a new round of the arms race on the world. The struggle with the terrorism of Moscow, a crusade against communism. Such were Washington's slogans, which were deliberately exacerbating the situation surrounding Poland. And it was not surprising that the Western special services needed countries of socialism to stand behind the assassination attempt on the life of the head of the Roman Catholic Church, a Pole by origin. Suddenly, but in a coordinated way, the Western press stated talking about Bulgrain terrorists. Then Agca, who had been in jail for more than 1 year already, recalled his Bulgarian accomplices, recalled after being visited by the Italian special services in his prison. Sergei Antonov, official of the Bulgarian airlines in Rome, was arrested.

## SHEVARDNADZE, IRAQ'S TARIQ 'AZIZ DISCUSS GULF WAR

LD171822 Moscow TASS in English 1818 GMT 17 Feb 86

[Text] Moscow, February 17 TASS -- Member of the Political Bureau of the CPSU Central Committee, Minister of Foreign Affairs of the USSR Eduard Shevardnadze had a conversation today with member of the Revolutionary Command Council, deputy prime minister, Minister of Foreign Affairs of the Iraqi Republic Tariq 'Aziz, who had arrived in Moscow on instruction of the "Committee of Seven" set up by the League of Arab countries in 1984 with the aim of helping to bring about an end to the war between Iran and Iraq.

Tariq 'Aziz informed Eduard Shevardnadze of the evaluations by the "Committee of Seven" of the dangerous situation that is taking shape in connection with the new offensive by Iranian troops and also the forthcoming study of this question in the United Nations Security Council that is to be convened on the request of the group of Arab countries.

Eduard Shevardnadze confirmed the Soviet Union's consistent line towards an earliest termination of the conflict and towards a settlement of the contentious issues existing between the sides by political means, at the negotiating table. Conviction was expressed that continuation of the Iranian-Iraqi war results only in heavy casualties and destruction for the peoples of the two countries. In this connection the Soviet side expressed concern over the growing scope of military operations, which is fraught with negative consequences for the cause of peace and stability in the entire region.

It was emphasized that bringing the conflict into the channel of peaceful solutions without delays in accordance with the generally recognized norms would meet the interests not only of the countries participating in the conflict but also, on a broader plane, the goals of ensuring international security. The imperialist forces, which are interested in a further heightening of tension in the region, should not be allowed to make use of the dragging out of the conflict.

Guided by such approach, the Soviet Union will continue to support all efforts which are being made in the direction of a peaceful settlement of the conflict, including that within the framework of the United Nations Organization and the U.N. Security Council.

Some matters of bilateral Soviet-Iraqi relations were also discussed during the conversation. On the same day Tariq 'Aziz left by air for New York to attend the U.N. Security Council's meeting.

## PRESS CONFERENCE ADDRESSES MIDEAST ISSUES

LD141754 Moscow International Service in Arabic 1530 GMT 14 Feb 86

[Excerpts] A press conference was held on 13 February at the press center of the USSR Ministry of Foreign Affairs. Valeriy Sukhin, the spokesman for the press department of the Foreign Ministry, answered a number of questions put by Soviet and foreign reporters.

Referring to the Iran-Iraq dispute, Valeriy Sukhin declared in particular that the Soviet attitude toward this war, which has been going on for many years, is known full well.

We regard it not just as a bloody tragedy, but also as extremely senseless, since it uses huge resources which Iran and Iraq could use equally for peaceful creative development, consolidating their economic independence, and ensuring a better future for their two peoples. It is very saddening that the war has resulted in the death of many ' thousands of people. We untiringly call for putting an end to the war; the sooner this takes place the better it will be for all. That is our stance, which the two warring countries and the world public opinion know full well.

In reply to a question about the nature of Soviet-Iraqi relations, the USSR foreign ministry spokesman declared: We have a treaty of friendship and cooperation with Iraq, which is the firm foundation of our bilateral relations and cooperation in various fields. The two sides have frequently declared, including during the recent visit by Iraqi President Saddam Husayn to the Soviet Union, their satisfaction with the state and scope of the development of Soviet-Iraqi relations on the firm basis of this treaty. The Soviet Union is implementing and will continue to implement its commitments connected with this treaty.

A number of questions put to Valeriy Sukhin dealt with the Soviet Union's relations with the countries of the Arabian Gulf. In reply to these questions Sukhin said the following: We have established diplomatic relations with Oman and diplomatic relations between our country and the UAE [United Arab Emirates] have existed since 1971, when that state was founded. Agreement has now been reached to exchange diplomatic missions at the level of embassies. The 60th anniversary of the establishment of diplomatic relations between the Soviet Union and Saudi Arabia will fall on 16 February. The Soviet side is prepared for the establishment of diplomatic relations between us -- not just formally, but also practically -- and says that there should be a Soviet embassy in Saudi Arabia and a Saudi Embassy in the Soviet Union. There are many opportunities for Soviet-Saudi relations to develop. The Soviet people congratulate the people of Saudi Arabia on the 60th anniversary of Soviet-Saudi diplomatic relations and express the hope that our relations will develop in the interest of the peoples of the two states.

## PDRY LEADER DENIES CLAIMS OF SOVIET INTERFERENCE

LD162128 Moscow TASS in English 2056 GMT 16 Feb 86

[Text] Kuwait, February 16 TASS -- The United States and its allies actively interfered in the January events in Democratic Yemen, trying to use the conflict to their ends, said Salim Salih Muhammad, deputy general secretary of the Central Committee of the Yemen Socialist Party, in an interview with the Kuwaiti newspaper AL-IYASAH. We have trustworthy information to the effect that representatives of a number of foreign states took part in planning and engineering the plot, instigated unrest in the country and financed the forces hostile to the progressive regime. Along with that U.S. propaganda was trying to provide a cover for Washington's sordid role in South Yemeni events, spread slanderous fabrications about some "Soviet interference" in the PDRY's [People's Democratic Republic of Yemen] affairs. In this connection I would like to note once again, he said, that the Soviet Union strictly adheres to the policy of non-interference in Democratic Yemen's internal affairs. By this policy the USSR jointly with the PDRY contributes to preventing foreign intervention in the region. Characterising the policy of the new leadership of Democratic Yemen, S.S. Muhammad stressed that it remains invariable. We will make everything in our power to preserve good relations with our neighbours along the principles of non-interference in each other's home affairs. Any tensions in relations between states serve no useful purpose either as regards the interests of their peoples or stability and security of the whole region, but only plays into the hand of Zionism and U.S. imperialism, said the deputy general secretary of the Central Committee of the Yemen Socialist Party.

REPORTAGE, COMMENT ON FIGHTING IN CHAD

French 'Military Interference'

LD161537 Moscow TASS in English 1213 GMT 16 Feb 86

[Text] Paris, February 16 TASS -- France has resumed a direct military interference in the internal affairs in Chad. The Ministry of Defence has announced here that today aircraft of the French Air Force delivered a bombing strike at an airfield of the Transitional Government of National Unity (TGNU) at Ouadi Doum in the north of that African country. The raid was made shortly after President Mitterrand's consultations in Paris with Defence Minister Paul Quiles who had made an inspection tour to Chad. Over there, the defence minister had met with the leader of the Ndjamena regime who requested the sending of new French military contingents to Chad.

U.S. Preparing 'Armed Interference'

PM151838 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 16 Feb 86 First Edition p 1

[TASS report under general heading "Situation Heating Up; Events in Chad"]

[Text] Washington, 15 Feb TASS -- The United States is preparing for active armed interference in Chad's affairs. Washington is maintaining constant contacts with the Paris and Ndjamena authorities, a U.S. State Department spokesman admitted here. He stressed that Washington is examining the question of "expediting the granting of military assistance to the pro-Western Habre government."

French 'Interventionist Corps'

LD171857 Moscow TASS in English 1542 GMT 17 Feb 86

[Text] Paris, February 17 TASS -- France is rushing its "containment forces," an interventionist corps, to Chad, according to French Defense Minister Paul Quiles. He said warplanes of the French Air Force will be landing in Ndjamena within the next few hours and will be based there on a permanent footing.

Dialogue Sought

LD170029 Moscow TASS in English 2017 GMT 16 Feb 86

[Text] Tripoli, February 16 TASS -- Libya favours an immediate end to hostilities in Chad, the JANA news agency said today. The resumption of fighting in Chad undermines the efforts of the African states for a peaceful settlement of the situation in the country, the commentary said.

As Beassoumal Nadjita, economics and finance minister of the Transitional National Unity Government said, the forces of his government had beaten back an attack of Ndjamena troops north of Oum Chalouba city and then launched a counter-offensive. He exposed the statements by a spokesmen for the Habre regime that it had allegedly "restored control" over that city and its outskirts. Such statements, the minister pointed out, has repeatedly expressed readiness for talks on national reconciliation. To this end Acheik Oumar, minister of state -- coordinator of the transitional government has been recently sent to Paris. He demanded that the French Government pressurise the Habre regime into agreeing to a dialogue.

If Habre does not agree to peace talks, the troops of the Transitional National Unity Government will carry on combat operations, Beassoumal Nadjita stressed.

Events Described

PM161710 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 17 Feb 86 First Edition p 4

[TASS, PRAVDA own correspondents report under the general heading "Direct Military Interference"]

[Text] Paris, 16 Feb TASS -- France has resumed direct military interference in the internal conflict in Chad. As the Defense Ministry here has announced, French Air Force aircraft today bombed the airfield of the Transitional Government of National Unity (GUNT) forces in Ouadi Doum in the north of the country.

Tripoli, 16 Feb TASS -- France has begun shipping military hardware including heavy artillery, machine guns, and armored personnel carriers to Ndjamena, the JANA news agency reports. In addition, the first detachment of French military servicemen has arrived in Chad.

GUNT forces repulsed an attack by Ndjamena's troops in a region north of the city of Oum Chalouba and then went onto the counteroffensive, (Beassumal Nadzhita), GUNT minister of economics and finance, has indicated here. He refuted statements by representatives of the Habre regime that they had "restored control" over that city and surrounding areas.

Paris, 16 Feb TASS -- The French Air Force's bombing of an airfield in northern Chad is unjustified, (Abderakhman Musa), GUNT's official representative in France, told AFP today. He rejected reports that Libyans are fighting alongside GUNT units.

Paris, 16 Feb (PRAVDA own correspondent M. Shchedrov) -- The mass media continue to create a fuss "around the events in Chad." Maps are being shown on television depicting the former French colony which is now an independent African state. Those maps invariably show the red line drawn 3 years ago by what a political observer has called "Paris' imperial neocolonial hand," a line dividing the country from west to east. According to a Paris statement, the crossing of this line by the opponents of the Ndjamena regime is regarded as an "impermissible act." Rumors of "Libyan interference" are again rife. Television, radio, and a number of newspapers report that the sharp buildup of military aid to the Ndjamena regime was followed by Paris' declaration of a state of combat readiness for the subunits and combat divisions of the French Air Force stationed at military bases in the Central African Republic and Gabon.

A "French air bridge" has again been established with Ndjamena, as happened some years ago during the neocolonial operation Manta. According to newspapers, citing confidential sources, the French Air Force's first bombing of the airfield in northern Chad may be followed by "more resolute actions." In this atmosphere a number of representatives of the right-wing French opposition and also of the ruling Socialist Party are openly urging the president to show "firmness" and loyalty to "treaties."

Algiers, 16 Feb (PRAVDA own correspondent S. Filatov) -- Algeria believes that everything must be done to end the fratricidal clashes in Chad and those who are mediating on Africa's behalf in the settlement of the problem must be allowed to carry out their mandate unhindered, an Algerian Foreign Ministry spokesman's statement published here says. The resumption of military actions in Chad is contrary to all the efforts being made in Africa to achieve national reconciliation in that country and protect it from foreign interference.

Algeria confirms its firm commitment to the plan for settling the Chad problem adopted at the 19th OAU session, the statement points out.

'Explosive Situation ' Results

LD171905 Moscow TASS in English 1441 GMT 17 Feb 86

[Text] Paris, February 17 TASS -- An explosive situation has developed in the centre of Africa as a result of France's growing armed intervention in Chad. As is reported by the FRANCE PRESSE news agency from Ndjamena, French warplanes are arriving uninterruptedly at the airport of the capital of Chad from the Central African Republic, Gabon and Cameroon. Troops, rocketry, artillery are being brought by an "air bridge" from France. More than 200 crack commandos have already been airlifted. No less than 1,300 troops and a squadron of fighter planes are expected to arrive in Chad in the near future.

The Transitional National Unity Government of Chad has denounced the "in-depth bombing of the Quadi Doum district by French aviation", runs a communique of the Transitional Unity Government. The actions of France which asserts that it allegedly has its rights to Chad are in line with the course of Paris, aimed at internationalization of the internal conflict in Chad and are a gross violation of the peoples' right to self-determination. The Transitional National Unity Government has reaffirmed the "readiness to positively respond to any proposals on a peace solution of Chad problems".

A representative of the Transitional National Unity Government in France has called upon the African governments to prevent their airports from being used by French military aviation which subject civilian population of Chad to bombing.

It is noted here that the intervention in Chad is a preplanned action. Invasion forces were amassed beforehand in the Central African Republic, stressed the newspaper LE MONDE. The French troops were airlifted to Chad at a time when a composite squadron of the U.S. Sixth Fleet is conducting provocative exercises off Libya's shores and when the U.S. Administration is building up the campaign of blackmail and threats against Libyan Jamahiriyah.

France ought to promote settlement of the situation in Chad through negotiations, but should not pour oil into the flames, said member of the Political Bureau of the French Communist Party Roland Leroy, speaking by the Radio France-Haute Normandie. Our country should not start a venture of a neocolonialist character, he said. The internal problems of Chad should be settled by the people of Chad themselves.

Interference Benefits U.S.

LD172007 Moscow TASS in English 1957 GMT 17 Feb 86

[Text] Moscow, February 17 TASS -- TASS political commentator Sergey Kulik writes:

Commenting on the alarming development of events in Chad, many foreign policy observers agree that France has decided to a new armed intervention in that country by far, not just to remind of its role of a defender of the West's interests in Africa. At the time when the 6th Fleet of the United States is engaged in provocative maneouvres off the shores of Libya in the north and Washington's threatens Tripoli with all sorts of punishment, the creation of an additional seat of tension, this time near the Jamahiriyah's southern borders, obviously will be appreciated in the White House.

The ever more discernible anti-Libyan accent which Paris wishes to impart to the intrusion in Chad, the contentions that French troops are being sent into that country in response to "Libyan activity" in border areas indicate that blackmail and threats against Tripoli are not the lowest priorities action in the sub-Saharan desert.

Materials appearing in the press point to the coordination of French and American actions in the preparation of this action. As it was admitted by the Paris JOURNAL DU DIMANCHE, French military specialists dealing with Chad had access to the latest intelligence information on that country supplied by American spy satellites. It was already after the present deterioration of events that Washington hastened with assurances that it will speed up the granting of six million dollars' worth of military aid to the pro-Western regime in Ndjamena in addition to the French military programme.

The Washington administration remembers that the first French intervention in Chad in 1983 had brought about a growth of American influence in that country, the appearance there of several hundred American military advisers and the construction of a United States military base in the south of Chad. So it wants to use the present situation as well to expand its military presence in that region.

It is obvious that such a development of events will not solve the internal conflict in Chad and will not boost the prestige of Habre's puppet regime that is encountering the population's growing resistance to its dictatorial methods and attempts to stifle the opposition by means of terror. Instead of sending troops and guns to Chad while simultaneously trying to prove its questionable rights to interfere in the internal affairs a former colony France should have supported the search for a peaceful settlement of the Chadian conflict undertaken by the Organization of African Unity (OAU).

It is exactly this road of solving the problem that is being seen by the countries that neighbour on Chad and whose interests are directly linked with the normalisation of the situation in that state. Libya's official news agency JANA has categorically refuted the charges of the Ndjamena regime about Libya's "participation" in combat operations in Chad and its striving to "seize" that country. Libya intends further to observe its commitments not to interfere in the internal conflict in Chad.

The Transitional Government of National Unity (TGNU) has also repeatedly declared for a peaceful solution of the Chadian problem. The government's minister-coordinating Acheikh Ibn Oumar was recently sent to Paris with this aim and urged the French Government to put pressure on Habre so that he would enter the dialogue.

The neocolonialist intervention in Chad came as a reply to this call for national reconciliation...

'Dual Objective' Pursued

PM171749 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 18 Feb 86 Morning Edition p 4

[A. Nikanorov "International Commentary": "Yet Another Intervention"]

[Text] Paris did not take long to ponder over the H. Habre regime's request to reintroduce its troops into Chad. And so, for the second time in less than 3 years, France is again engaged in armed intervention against its former colony.

The first operation, codenamed "Manta" and launched in August 1983, did not result in any great glory for Paris.

Even at that time there was talk in the French capital that much greater dividends were earned by Washington from that adventure, which opened the door for expansion of its own presence in this important strategic zone in Africa. The years since then have confirmed the correctness of this assessment. Several hundred U.S. military advisers are now settled in Chad and, according to official spokesman of the National Unity Transition Government, are participating directly in combat actions. The volume of U.S. arms deliveries, including tanks and rockets, has grown steadily. The army of Habre, who was put in power by the efforts of Western special services, is actively mastering the new equipment in Kanem Prefecture, in the west of the country, under the leadership of Pentagon instructors. A U.S. military base is being created in southern Chad.

During this same period the Ndjamena regime, "saved" by Western patrons, has shown its real face. Even the Paris newspaper LE FIGARO, which can hardly be suspected of being sympathetic with the national liberation movement, wrote that "Habre's soldiers behaved like an occupying force, resorting to all kinds of repressions." Today the punitive actions have become even more cruel. Nonetheless, opposition to the "local occupiers" is growing.

The present "pacification" operation, just like "Manta," has been launched on the basis of unfounded claims by Ndjamena, Paris, and Washington about some kind of Libyan complicity in the exacerbation of the situation in Chad. All this is happening at a time when the U.S. 6th Fleet is conducting provocative maneuvers right next to the Libyan coast. The organizers of crude interference in other people's affairs display no end of cynicism. A dual objective is being pursued behind the smokescreen of noisy propaganda: To keep their protege in Ndjamena and simultaneously, to step up the campaign of blackmail and threats against the Libyan Jamahiriyah.

This is fully in line with Washington's concept of "neoglobalism" which is, in effect, the same old hegemonist policy of U.S. imperialism in new packaging. As far as France is concerned, its armed intervention directly furthers the implementation of the transatlantic partner's schemes.

## SWAPO LEADER CITED ON NAMIBIA TALKS, SAVIMBI

LD152038 Moscow TASS in English 2015 GMT 15 Feb 86

[Text] Dar es Salaam, February 15 TASS -- The South West Africa People's Organisation (SWAPO) and its military wing -- the People's Liberation Army of Namibia will step up the armed struggle against the South African occupiers until ultimate victory is won, said Sam Nujoma, SWAPO president, addressing newsmen here. The linkage put forward by the USA for the resolution of the problem of granting independence to Namibia with the question of withdrawal of Cuban internationalists from Angola serves in real fact towards blocking Resolutions 435 of the Security Council, Sam Nujoma stressed. The SWAPO president described as Washington's fresh "deceptive manoeuvre" the secret meeting in Geneva between Chester Crocker, U.S. assistant secretary of state for African affairs, and Roelof Botha, South African foreign minister. The aim of these meetings, the SWAPO president said, is to deceive international public.

Touching upon the meeting of U.S. President Reagan with Savimbi, chief of the UNITA gangs, Sam Nujoma pointed out that these actions of the U.S. Administration are added proof of the fact that the White House further intends to interfere in the internal affairs of sovereign African states. The reception accorded to Savimbi, Sam Nujoma said, is graphic evidence of Washington's readiness to broaden support for its puppets.